

ployés engaged in the same business in the same city relative to the same subject—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. A. Cobleigh and 34 others, employers and employés engaged in the same business at Canton, Ill., relating to the same subject—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. C. Dickey and 13 others, employers and employés of the Cain & Dickey cigar factory of Canton, Ill., relating to the same subject—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. M. Armstrong and 83 others, employers and employés of the Armstrong & Bros. cigar factory of Canton, Ill., relative to the same subject—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John S. Conklin and 15 others, employers and employés of the Conklin & Bean cigar factory, of Canton, Ill., relative to the same subject—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Savill & Rafferty and 35 others, employers and employés of the Savill & Rafferty's cigar factory, of Canton, Ill., relative to the same subject—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. O. Dean and 118 others, employers and employés of W. O. Dean cigar factory, of Canton, Ill., relative to the same subject—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles H. Labree and 9 others, employers and employés, engaged in the manufacture of cigars and tobacco at Canton, Ill., relative to the same subject—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. H. Eyesly and 39 others, employers and employés, engaged in the manufacture of cigars in Canton, Ill., relative to the same subject—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the State Grange of Illinois Patrons of Husbandry, favoring the construction by the General Government of a deep-water ship-canal connecting the lakes and Mississippi River by way of the Illinois and Michigan Canal and the Illinois River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the same body, favoring the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Elections.

Also, petition of Wilson Eloquiat, of Peoria, Ill., relating to the duty on photographic albumen paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition on claim of Malone, of Giles County, Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition on claim of Terrell T. Crowder, of same county and State—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition on claim of Jerre B. Cobb, of same county and State—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition on claim of John C. P. Reed, of same county and State—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition on claim of Richard P. Thweatt, of same county and State—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition on claim of Murdock M. Malone, of same county and State—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition on claim of James A. Butler, of same county and State—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition on claim of Jackson J. Ashford, of same county and State—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Jackson J. Ashford, of same county and State—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition on claim of James C. Ferry, of Davidson County, Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition on claim of William F. Cole, of Giles County, Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSK: Petition of certain citizens of Maryland, in favor of pure lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, papers in the matter of the application for pension of Rachel Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, deposition in the matter of the same application—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Protest of A. Troland & Co., of Norwich, Conn., against increase of duty on tin-plate—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of M. C. Wright and 100 others, for increase of duty on hops—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAHLNECKER: Petition of Knights of Labor Assembly, No. 4, St. Louis, Mo., against impure food, and favoring the Conger bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of the National Vinegar-Makers' Association, against section 32 of the McKinley tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Anti-Lottery League of Louisiana, against granting a new charter and a renewal of the same to the Lottery Company—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition and statement, with circular of information for the importers and dealers of flax and jute goods, protesting against an increase of duty and praying for a decrease of the same, with arguments attached—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TARSNEY: Remonstrance of citizens of Kansas City, Mo., against House bill 8278—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Commercial Club of Kansas City, Mo., favoring repeal of certain sections of interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of the Butchers' National Protective Association of America, favoring Conger pure-lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Harriet Dixon, administratrix of the estate of Ebenezer Dixon, Jackson County, Missouri, relative to claim for commissary supplies (\$1,120), and to send the same to the Court of Claims under the act of the 3d of March, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania: Petition against increasing the duty on imported marble—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Patrons of Husbandry of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, asking import duties on agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, asking for free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petitions for passage of laws for perpetuation of national-banking system, from the same Congressional district—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, protest of citizens of the same Congressional district, against the tobacco provision in the tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUCKER: Petition of voters of Amherst County, State of Virginia, in favor of deep harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Joseph Click, of Augusta County, Virginia, for reference of claim to Court of Claims under the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN SCHAICK: Resolutions of the Wisconsin Commandery, Military Order of the Loyal Legion, urging the prompt completion and publication of the Rebellion Records—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WILKINSON: Petition of Eliza A. Phillips, and others, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YARDLEY: Petition of officers and representatives of a grange in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, asking for free coinage—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of officers and representatives of Grange No. 451, of same county and State, for the same law—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. YODER: Petition of citizens against the passage of House bill 8278, to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 14, 1890.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations required for the office of the surveyor-general of South Dakota for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting additional information relative to evasions and violations of the laws for the exclusion of Chinese laborers, embodied in a report of D. A. Coon, special inspector at San Diego, Cal.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Immigration, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draught of a bill (with copy of an accompanying letter from the Acting Superintendent of the Census) providing for the free registration of official mail matter by census officers; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Census, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in compliance with a resolution of March 24, 1890, reports of the tests made at Newport and Annapolis of a new method of firing shells charged with nitro-glycerine from ordinary guns, together with a report of Professor Charles C. Munroe of the results of an examination of americanite.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] desire to have the accompanying papers printed?

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, yes; I want them printed. I understand the subject-matter is now before the Appropriations Committee. For the present, I think the papers had better be referred to that committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. INGALLS presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Pittsburgh, Kans., praying for the passage of House bill 344, granting right

of way to the Pittsburgh, Fort Smith and Columbus Railway Company through the Indian Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Martha Ann Stillings and other settlers upon the Fort Brooke military reservation in Florida, praying for relief; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of citizens of the Mississippi Valley, praying for legislation in support of the levee system to prevent the overflow of the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DAVIS presented resolutions adopted by the Toledo Association of Ex-Prisoners of War, in favor of the passage of the pension bill known as the Morrill bill; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of 14 jobbers and retailers of dry goods, citizens of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the great increase of duties proposed by the McKinley tariff bill on dress goods manufactured wholly or in part of wool, and also on manufactures of silk; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Norwich, Conn., praying for the establishment of a limited postal-telegraph system as a bureau or part of the Post-Office Department; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of the executive committee of the Ohio State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, indorsing the action of their national legislative committee in demanding certain legislation; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GIBSON presented concurrent resolutions of the State government of Louisiana; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATON ROUGE, LA., May 13, 1890.

To Senator R. L. GIBSON:

The following resolutions passed both branches of the Legislature to-day and have my approval:

“Concurrent resolutions.

“SECTION 1. *Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring therein),* That we, the General Assembly of Louisiana in session convened, do unhesitatingly affirm and assert our entire confidence in the levee system as at present maintained for the protection of the people of Louisiana from the devastation and destruction of their property and homes by disastrous floods.

“SEC. 2. *Be it resolved, etc.,* That we do condemn what is known as the outlet theory as impracticable and as destructive to the property interests of the State and people.”

FRANCIS T. NICHOLS, Governor.

Mr. PADDOCK presented a memorial of the Farmers' Alliance of Casanova, Va., remonstrating against the passage of what are known as the produce, subtreasury, and warehouse bills; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BLAIR presented four petitions of citizens of Cheshire, Hillsborough, and Merrimac, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the passage of what is known as the “pure food” bill; which were referred to the Committee on Agricultural and Forestry.

He also presented two petitions of citizens of Merrimac and Cheshire, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the passage of what is known as the “pure-lard” bill; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 312) for the relief of Thomas P. Morgan, jr., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1559) for the relief of the estate of A. H. Herr, deceased, late of the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLUMB submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 3213) to make the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries an officer of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, heretofore reported by him; which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7345) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to establish new harbor-lines in Portage Lake, Houghton County, Michigan, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2877) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to establish new harbor-lines in Portage Lake, Houghton County, Michigan, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. FRYE. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce to report back adversely the joint and concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri asking Congress to appropriate \$25,000 to the county of Stone in said State for the purpose of constructing and erecting a bridge over the James River at or near Galena, etc., and to say that the United States never has made any appropriation for any bridge within any State or within the United States except in one or two instances where the river bridged has been a boundary-line between the United States and a foreign country.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does a written report accompany that?

Mr. FRYE. There is no written report. There is nothing to be said in a written report beyond what I have just stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee will be discharged from the further consideration of the memorial.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3423) to provide for the completion of the improvement of Mobile Harbor, Alabama, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. CAMERON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2701) concerning the rank and pay of certain officers of the Navy having served a full term as chief of a bureau in the Navy Department, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, reported an amendment intended to be proposed to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 398) subjecting imported liquors to the provisions of the laws of the several States. I also present a written report to accompany the bill, and with it the concurring view of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], which I ask may, under the rule, be printed.

I wish also to state in connection with this subject, in view of the conditions surrounding it, that I shall ask the Senate at an early day to take up the bill for consideration. I hope that it may receive favorable action and go to the other House for its concurrence.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar, and the report and accompanying papers will be printed.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to make a brief statement in regard to the matter. This bill is rendered necessary, in the opinion of the committee, by the late decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which holds, as I understand it, that intoxicating liquor manufactured in one State, conveyed into another, and there sold by the manufacturer or his agent, is protected by the Constitution of the United States from any regulation or prohibition of that sale by the State law on the ground that such prohibition or regulation is an interference with the regulation of commerce between the States. The court, in their opinion, say that the States can not pass such prohibitory or regulating statutes without the permission of Congress, which is understood to imply an opinion on the part of the court that Congress may give that permission, and that with that permission the States may pass the regulation or prohibitory enactment which they see fit.

I wholly concur in the propriety of this bill, but I suppose the principle of the opinion of the Supreme Court applies as well to gunpowder that a State may deem insecure and may desire to regulate the sale of as dangerous to safety, or to opium, a deadly drug, and poisons of all kinds. I should have preferred, myself, that the bill should apply to all articles the prohibition or regulation of the sale of which a State thinks necessary for its health, morals, or safety; but, as so large a number of State laws in regard to the sale of intoxicating liquors are affected by this proposed legislation, it is quite important that it should not be delayed, and therefore I agree with the rest of the committee in this bill.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish simply to say on this same subject that I was of the opinion that philosophically the bill ought to be a comprehensive one to cover all the things that the States fairly under their constitutions should have a right to treat as related to their health and domestic safety, but for the reasons stated by the Senator from Massachusetts I assented to this bill limited to intoxicating liquors.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Census I report—

Mr. VEST. Before the Senator from Maine proceeds, if he will permit me, as a member of the committee from which the bill was reported, I desire to say that I do not concur with the report of the majority. I have in my hand a report made by the majority of the committee upon a bill having the same object as that now reported to the Senate, that report having been made at the last Congress and before the recent decision by the Supreme Court. I simply want to repeat that my opinions are not changed upon this subject at all, although the shape in which the matter is brought before the Senate is changed. In that majority report (and here is the essence of it) the Judiciary Committee declare:

It is equally clear that Congress can not part with or delegate to a State any power which has not been reserved to it. Congress can not return to the States a power given by the Constitution to Congress; much more can not Congress delegate or surrender a granted power to any portion of the States, for that would *pro tanto* invest those States with powers not possessed by the others.

This was the opinion of the majority of the Judiciary Committee at the last Congress. Afterwards the Supreme Court of the United States delivered an opinion in the Iowa case, in which there is a dictum, and nothing else, declaring that certainly until Congress gave permission to a State to exclude liquor in the original packages the State of Iowa had no power to pass the act which was then before the Supreme Court for construction.

I do not believe the Supreme Court of the United States ever intended to assert that Congress could permit a State to invade the exclusive interstate-commerce power of the National Congress. This bill, although it comes in a different shape from the other, does the same thing, and if we now can pass this measure giving to the State of Iowa the power to declare what is a subject of interstate commerce, as is done by this bill, the same power can be given under similar circumstances as to any other article of interstate commerce to Missouri and every

other State in the Union. The result would be the absolute deprivation of all interstate jurisdiction by Congress and giving it to the respective States.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to say in reference to the report my friend has alluded to that I was in the minority of the committee on that occasion, and united with one or two other Senators in a minority report which is printed, and which is in entire conformity with the action the committee has now taken.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I desire to say also that I was one of the minority of the Committee on the Judiciary not concurring in the report to which the Senator from Missouri has referred.

I also wish to say, in response to what may be regarded as an inference that may be legitimately drawn from the remark of the Senator from Missouri, that this bill is not confined in its effect and provisions to the State of Iowa. It applies to all the States of the Union; and it is induced largely in its present form by the suggestion made by the Supreme Court in its recent decision that the States can not interfere with this article of interstate commerce, to wit, intoxicating liquors, except by permission of Congress. While I may not believe that that is a sound interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, I recognize the suggestion and regard it as a possible method of removing from the way of the States that obstacle which prevents the enforcement of their just police powers.

I may say that under that decision, without some such legislation as this, no State in this Union can ever apply prohibition, license, local option, or any other form of control to the subject of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. It is in order that the States may have what has always been regarded as their right that this bill adopts the way suggested by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, what is the subject pending before the Senate?

Mr. HALE. I am endeavoring, if the confessions of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary have been completed, to proceed to business.

Mr. PLUMB. I only wanted to know what was before the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. The Committee on the Judiciary have made a report on one of the most important questions now pending in this country—

Mr. PLUMB. I rise to a point of order. What is the question pending? I object to any further proceeding until the Chair rules upon my point of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No question is pending.

Mr. HALE. The bill reported from the Judiciary Committee has been sent to the Calendar long ago.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

Mr. PLUMB. I object to the Senator proceeding until the Presiding Officer rules upon the point of order. I make the point of order that nothing is before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is no question pending before the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. I desire—

Mr. PLUMB. I ask leave to introduce a resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to be heard upon the point of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. PLUMB. All right. I ask that the Senator from Maine may be heard.

Mr. HALE. I report from the Committee on the Census—

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts can proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. PLUMB. I object.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I rise—

Mr. PLUMB. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects.

Mr. HOAR. What is the pending question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is no pending question.

Mr. HOAR. What is the pending order?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Reports of standing and select committees are still in order. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] reports a bill from the Committee on the Census.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to inquire if any question is pending.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill reported by the Senator from Maine from the Committee on the Census will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3821) authorizing the registration of census mail matter.

Mr. HOAR. I move that that report be recommitted to the committee which just made it.

Mr. PLUMB. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the report be recommitted to the Committee on the Census.

Mr. PLUMB. I object. It is out of order. I rise to a point of order. I submit that it is not in order at this time to move to recommit the report. That must come at a later point in the proceedings.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I have been seeking to make this report

from the Committee on the Census for the last quarter of an hour, and when I make it I do not want to be mashed between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HOAR. I never saw such an exhibition of boorishness on this floor before.

Mr. PLUMB. Then the Senator from Massachusetts never looked into the glass, which he can do every day and find a better exposition of it.

Mr. BLAIR. I object to debate on the part of the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion to recommit is not in order, as the bill is not under consideration.

Mr. HALE. I ask unanimous consent, as this is a little bill conferring upon the mail matter of the Census Office the right of registration, that the Senate consider and pass it now.

Mr. PLUMB. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go upon the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. I withdraw the report for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine withdraws the report.

Mr. HALE. No, let it go to the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are still in order.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6946) providing for the sale of navy-yard and United States naval-hospital lands in the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., reported it without amendment.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3886) to incorporate the North River Bridge Company and to authorize the construction of a bridge and approaches at New York City across the Hudson River, to regulate commerce in and over such bridge between the States of New York and New Jersey, and to establish such bridge a military and post road, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2292) to authorize the construction of a bridge and approaches at New York City across the Hudson River, to regulate commerce over such bridge in and between the States of New York and New Jersey, and to establish such bridge a military and post road, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, reported an amendment intended to be proposed to the Post-Office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. EDMUNDS introduced a bill (S. 3822) to establish the University of the United States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. EDMUNDS. This is a special and peculiar subject. This bill is a rough draught I made when I was not well, and it may not be at all perfect. I have introduced it in order that the subject may be considered, and as it is a special and peculiar subject, with the assent of my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I move that it be referred to a select committee of nine.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so referred in the absence of objection.

Mr. EDMUNDS introduced a bill (S. 3823) in amendment of and supplementary to the act of Congress, approved March 22, 1882, entitled "An act to amend section 5350 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in reference to bigamy, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3824) to obtain depositions in foreign countries in criminal cases; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3825) for the relief of Professor Peter Collier; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 3826) for the relief of Henry Unterleiter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 3827) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Exeter, in the State of New Hampshire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 3828) to improve Charlotte Harbor, Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MCPHERSON introduced a bill (S. 3829) for the relief of Charles W. Cronk; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BARBOUR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3830) to prohibit book-making of any kind and pool-selling in the District of Columbia for the purpose of gaming; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a bill (S. 3831) to provide for the delivery of land patents to their rightful owners; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PAYNE introduced a bill (S. 3832) granting lands to the Territory of New Mexico for common-school, university, and other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 83) authorizing the Wyandotte tribe of Indians to sell and dispose of a certain tract of land; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. QUAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

EDWIN S. FURMAN.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 2770) granting a pension to Edwin S. Furman.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT STREET RAILWAYS.

Mr. EDMUNDS submitted the following resolutions; which were considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to inquire whether any of the street-railway corporations in the District of Columbia have failed to pay any taxes, assessments, or other dues lawfully assessed or made against them, and if so to what amount, and whether, in consequence of any such failure or neglect, the franchises of any of said companies ought to be forfeited.

Resolved, That said committee in respect to the foregoing inquiry have power to send for persons and papers, and to report by bill or otherwise.

LAND PATENTS.

Mr. PLUMB submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to inform the Senate the number of land patents issued by the Government and which have been retained in the General Land Office for more than one year, whether facilities have been afforded private persons for obtaining the names of persons to whom said patents were issued, and what legislation, if any, is necessary to secure the prompt delivery of said patents to those who are entitled to the same.

FOND DU LAC INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. DAVIS. I offer the following resolution, and ask for its present consideration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to investigate, and report to the Senate as soon as practicable, into the alleged facts of the non-fulfillment of the fourth article of the treaty with the Chippewas at La Pointe, Wis., September 30, 1854, wherein it was stipulated that the reservation for the Fond du Lac band should embrace the following boundaries:

"Beginning at an island in the St. Louis River, above Knife Portage, called by the Indians Paw-paw-soo-me-me-tig, running thence west to the boundary line heretofore described; thence north along said boundary line to the mouth of Savannah River; thence down the St. Louis River to the place of beginning; and if said tract shall contain less than 100,000 acres, a strip of land shall be added on the south side thereof large enough to equal such deficiency;" and

Whereas when the survey was made it was grossly inaccurate, diminishing the stipulated reservation many thousands of acres; the amount taken from the Indians was sold by the Government as public lands, thus depriving, as is alleged, the Indians of a large and valuable part of their reservation. (See Executive Document No. 247, Fifty-first Congress, first session, House of Representatives, page 24.)

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I do not wish to make any objection to this resolution, but I wish to call the attention of the Committee on Public Lands to the fact that a resolution has just been passed without objection asking for information in regard to the great number of patents which have been held in the office of the Commissioner of Public Lands. I introduced a resolution some weeks ago, which I conceive to be of very great importance to the people of Florida, asking for the information on the files of that office in reference to the selection of swamp and overflowed lands in that State. There was objection made to it, and it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands. I have heard nothing from it. I do not think it has been reported back again, and I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that it is of very great importance to the people of that State, and will involve much less trouble than the reply to the resolution which has been agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. DAWES. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DAWES subsequently said: I move a reconsideration of the reference of the resolution just introduced by the Senator from Minnesota to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PILLAGER INDIANS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to examine into and report to the Senate as soon as practicable as to the facts alleged by the Pillager bands of the Chippewa Indians in Minnesota, in which they claim that they were greatly damaged by the non-fulfillment of the treaty made at Leech Lake, August 21, 1847, whereby they ceded to the United States over 700,000 acres of land for a nominal sum. The main consideration for said cession was the unfulfilled promise of the occupying of said tract by the Menomonee Indians, who were not only at peace with the Pillagers, but with the Sioux Indians. This occupying of the country between the belligerents was believed would eventuate in peace. (See Executive Document No. 247, Fifty-first Congress, first session, House of Representatives, pages 18 and 125; also article 3 of treaty with Pillagers, August 21, 1847, revision of Indian treaties, page 212; article 3, treaty with Menomonees, October 18, 1847, revision of Indian treaties, page 485; article 3, treaty with Menomonees, May 12, 1854, revision of Indian treaties, page 485.)

REGISTRATION OF CENSUS MAIL-MATTER.

Mr. HALE. If no Senator objects I should like to call up the little census mail-matter bill that I reported this morning, and have it put on its passage.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRIS. Let the bill be read, subject to objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the bill (S. 3821) authorizing the registration of census mail-matter:

Be it enacted, etc., That all mail-matter, of whatever class, relative to the census and addressed to the Census Office, to the Superintendent of Census, his chief clerk, supervisors, or enumerators, and indorsed "Official business, Department of the Interior, Census Office, Registered," shall be transported free by registered mail; and if any person shall make use of any such mark of registration to avoid the payment of any registry fee on his private letter, package, or other matter in the mail, the person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of \$300, to be prosecuted in any court of competent jurisdiction.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 150) to print the eulogies upon Samuel Sullivan Cox; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 682) to continue in force the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1885, and entitled "An act to protect the fish in the Potomac River in the District of Columbia, and to provide a spawning ground for shad and herring in the said Potomac River."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

- A bill (H. R. 5617) granting a pension to Henry Bloomfield;
- A bill (H. R. 5299) for the relief of Chloe Cooper;
- A bill (H. R. 5238) granting a pension to Allen Coons;
- A bill (H. R. 5309) to place the name of Mary Welch upon the pension-roll;
- A bill (H. R. 5798) for the relief of Alexander Thompson;
- A bill (H. R. 5886) granting a pension to David Deans;
- A bill (H. R. 5862) granting a pension to Margaret Z. Austin;
- A bill (H. R. 5849) granting a pension to Catharine Sapp;
- A bill (H. R. 6078) granting a pension to Frank Traynor;
- A bill (H. R. 6296) granting a pension to Samantha Williams;
- A bill (H. R. 6401) granting a pension to Fanny W. Mudgett, dependent mother;
- A bill (H. R. 6568) increasing the pension of Mrs. Dorothea D. Yates;
- A bill (H. R. 6624) increasing the pension of Walter P. Harrison;
- A bill (H. R. 6775) to pension R. C. Martin for services rendered in the war with Mexico;
- A bill (H. R. 6915) granting a pension to Douglass Smith;
- A bill (H. R. 6914) pensioning Harriet B. White;
- A bill (H. R. 6875) granting a pension to Eliza Marcy;
- A bill (H. R. 6871) for the relief of Napoleon B. McKay;
- A bill (H. R. 6825) granting a pension to Mary A. Wood;
- A bill (H. R. 7078) granting a pension to Mary B. Stidger;
- A bill (H. R. 7101) granting a pension to Joseph Perkins;
- A bill (H. R. 7329) granting a pension to Harman Day;
- A bill (H. R. 7336) granting a pension to Charles Kernan;
- A bill (H. R. 7414) granting a pension to Washington F. Short;
- A bill (H. R. 7685) granting a pension to Julia E. Phillips;
- A bill (H. R. 7743) granting a pension to Allen Feathers;
- A bill (H. R. 7765) granting a pension to James F. Irwin;
- A bill (H. R. 7878) granting a pension to Irene D. Swan;
- A bill (H. R. 7953) granting a pension to Barbara Langstaff;
- A bill (H. R. 8087) granting a pension to Johnson Reddick;
- A bill (H. R. 9041) to increase the pension of William Hamill; and
- A bill (H. R. 9205) to grant a pension to Julia A. Erskine.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF SENATOR BECK.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the expenses of the funeral of Hon. James B. Beck, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky, be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT YORK, PA.

Mr. QUAY. If the morning business is concluded I should like to have unanimous consent of the Senate for the passage of a bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there is no further morning business, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business coming over from yesterday, being the bill (S. 2350) authorizing the issue of Treasury notes on deposits of silver bullion.

Mr. QUAY. I ask that that be informally laid aside for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 749) for the erection of a public building at York, Pa. It will lead to no discussion.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site, and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including fire-proof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices, in the city of York and State of Pennsylvania, the cost of said site and building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, complete, not to exceed the sum of \$80,000.

Proposals for the sale of land suitable for said site shall be invited by public advertisement in one or more of the newspapers of said city of largest circulation for at least twenty days prior to the date specified in said advertisement for the opening of said proposals.

Proposals made in response to said advertisement shall be addressed and mailed to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall then cause the said proposed sites, and such others as he may think proper to designate, to be examined in person by an agent of the Treasury Department, who shall make written report to said Secretary of the results of said examination, and of his recommendation thereon, and the reasons therefor, which shall be accompanied by the original proposals and all maps, plats, and statements which shall have come into his possession relating to the said proposed sites.

If, upon consideration of said report and accompanying papers, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem further investigation necessary, he may appoint a commission of not more than three persons, one of whom shall be an officer of the Treasury Department, which commission shall also examine the said proposed sites and such others as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and grant such hearings in relation thereto as they shall deem necessary; and said commission shall, within thirty days after such examination, make to the Secretary of the Treasury written report of their conclusion in the premises, accompanied by all statements, maps, plats, or documents taken by or submitted to them, in like manner as hereinbefore provided in regard to the proceedings of said agent of the Treasury Department; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon finally determine the location of the building to be erected.

The compensation of said commissioners shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the same shall not exceed \$6 per day and actual traveling expenses: *Provided, however*, That the member of said commission appointed from the Treasury Department shall be paid only his actual traveling expenses.

No money shall be used for the purposes mentioned, until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Pennsylvania shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of civil process therein.

The building shall be unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read "A bill to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at York, in the State of Pennsylvania."

Mr. QUAY. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and ask for a conference with the other House thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. QUAY, Mr. SPOONER, and Mr. PASCO were appointed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask leave to call up a bill similar to the one just passed. It is the bill (S. 3282) for the erection of a public building at Rock Island, Ill.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, I give notice that at the earliest opportunity it is my purpose to move an executive session this afternoon. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], it is understood, desires to proceed upon the unfinished business which is now before the Senate formally. I do not desire to interfere with the convenience of the Senator from Colorado, and it is certainly in the direction of public convenience that the discussion of the unfinished business should proceed and the time not be taken up by the consideration of cases on the Calendar. It is disagreeable to object to the request of the Senator from Illinois, but he knows the reason why it is essential that the

motion to which I have referred should be made, and made at an early hour to-day.

Mr. CULLOM. The bill I ask to have considered will take but a very few minutes. It will occasion no discussion. If there should be any it can go over.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 3282) for the erection of a public building at Rock Island, Ill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including fire-proof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices, in the city of Rock Island and State of Illinois, the cost of said site and building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, complete, not to exceed the sum of \$100,000.

Proposals for the sale of land suitable for said site shall be invited by public advertisement in one or more of the newspapers of said city of largest circulation for at least twenty days prior to the date specified in said advertisement for the opening of said proposals.

Proposals made in response to said advertisement shall be addressed and mailed to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall then cause the said proposed sites, and such others as he may think proper to designate, to be examined in person by an agent of the Treasury Department, who shall make written report to said Secretary of the results of said examination, and of his recommendation thereon, and the reasons therefor, which shall be accompanied by the original proposals and all maps, plats, and statements which shall have come into his possession relating to the said proposed sites.

If, upon consideration of said report and accompanying papers, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem further investigation necessary, he may appoint a commission of not more than three persons, one of whom shall be an officer of the Treasury Department, which commission shall also examine the said proposed sites, and such others as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and grant such hearings in relation thereto as they shall deem necessary; and said commission shall, within thirty days after such examination, make to the Secretary of the Treasury written report of their conclusion in the premises, accompanied by all statements, maps, plats, or documents taken by or submitted to them, in like manner as hereinbefore provided in regard to the proceedings of said agent of the Treasury Department; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon finally determine the location of the building to be erected.

The compensation of said commissioners shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the same shall not exceed \$6 per day and actual traveling expenses: *Provided, however*, That the member of said commission appointed from the Treasury Department shall be paid only his actual traveling expenses.

No money appropriated by this act shall be available, except as hereinbefore provided, until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Illinois shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of civil process therein.

The building shall be unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Rock Island, in the State of Illinois."

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 12th instant approved and signed the act (S. 3472) for improving Aransas Pass.

The message also announced that the President had to-day approved and signed the act (S. 948) for the relief of Laban Heath & Co., of Boston, Mass.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 150) to print the eulogies upon Samuel Sullivan Cox was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

TREASURY NOTES AND SILVER BULLION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2350) authorizing the issue of Treasury notes on deposits of silver bullion, the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. PLUMB to the amendment to the bill submitted by Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the question before the Senate, if this may be considered a bill in relation to the use of silver as money, is perhaps the most important question that can be presented or has been presented to the American Senate, if since the demonetization of silver in 1873 it can be said truthfully that the question was ever presented to the American Senate.

Mr. President, the silver question, as it is called, is not a local question, and I desire for myself to disclaim any anxiety for or any special interest in advancing the price of American silver, save and except that it is an American product. Therefore I and all other Americans ought to have an interest in its advancement, and further as that advancement will tend towards its use as a money metal. In other words, if silver is not to be used as money, I have but little interest in the advancement of the price of silver.

The people of the State that I represent have comparatively little more interest in the advancement of the price of silver than other people; for, while we produce one-sixth of the silver of the world, we do not depend entirely upon our silver production, and we expect very shortly, in the immediate future, that the other interests of the State will far outweigh the interest of mere silver production. And the silver production of the United States, while it has amounted to 50,000,000 ounces, as it is said, last year, is an insignificant production in comparison with the great interests of this country that we think are involved in its rehabilitation as a money metal.

The silver question is not local in its character either as confined to one portion of this country or as confined to the American continent. It is a question that to-day is attracting the attention of all people everywhere. It has continued now for fifteen years to attract the attention of the financial and economic world. The brightest and ablest men of this generation have given time, attention, study, and thought to this question, and it can not be cried down as a local measure. It will not do to simply say that the silver barons of the West are demanding it. It will not do to simply say that it is demanded in the interest of cheap money. It is demanded in the interest of humanity, in the interest of civilization, in the interest of progress, in the interest of the whole human race. He who approaches this subject with an idea that it is local in character, insignificant in importance, ought not to discuss it at all, for it is self-evident that he is ignorant of the great question that he attempts to handle.

Mr. President, the question presented, not for the American people alone, but for the entire world, is whether we shall do business in the future as we have done business in the past or until within the last seventeen years by the use of the two precious metals, not made money by law, not made money metals by the edict of legislative minds, not by the consent of the merchants, but by the fiat of the Almighty when He created these two metals. The one goes hand in hand with the other. You can no more dispense with gold than you can with silver. The two are twin metals, allied and united by the Creator for beneficent purposes of the human race. It is with that idea that I approach this question, realizing what the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] so well said yesterday, that money is indispensable to the civilized world, indispensable to the happiness of man, and that the number of units regulates its value.

Mr. President, I do not want to take time to give you a dissertation on the philosophy of money. I approach this question in a practical way and from a practical standpoint. I propose to briefly discuss it to-day. Should an opportunity be presented later I may present some other views which occur to me, but to-day I want to deal with it practically as a practical question affecting, as I say, the American people and affecting all other peoples, and believing as I do that the action of the American Congress upon this subject is more potent and more influential in the financial world than the action of any other Government that can be taken upon this subject, Great Britain and France not excepted.

We are to-day the richest people on the face of the earth. We are the most enterprising, the most progressive, and we have before us the greatest hopes and the greatest expectations of any people in the world, not vain expectations, but expectations that sensible, thinking, intelligent people everywhere admit are rightfully indulged in by us, 65,000,000 people with the number increasing at the rate of 2,000,000 a year. There are now members of this body who, if they shall sit in this Chamber as long as some members have sat in it, will see 130,000,000 people in the United States, with wealth untold. Why should not our action be potent on all nations of the world?

No, Mr. President, it is not a question simply whether we shall have four and one-half millions more of money a month or less, but it is, first, whether we shall provide for the American people a sufficiency of money with which they may transact properly the business of this country, and, secondly, whether we shall put ourselves in a position where we can aid potentially in bringing about what I believe to-day every practical financier almost in the world, every political economist almost on the face of the earth admits is essential to prosperity and progress, the use of silver as money; not as token money, but on equal terms with gold.

Mr. President, when we assembled here in December last there was a general demand made in this country for more money. The demand had been growing year by year; there had been first the small murmur of discontent and finally it grew until it was like the voice of thunder. Everybody heard it. It reached the Finance Committee of this body, strange as it may appear; they at last became sensible that there was a demand made upon them for circulation in this country which had been made before, but which they had not heeded. The Secretary of the Treasury in his report to Congress recognized the necessity of more money. He said we needed it. How much? Mr. President, I have not found yet any member of the Finance Committee, I have not found any executive officer yet who has been able to tell how much. The fundamental inquiry, the fundamental question, when you come to deal with money, is, how much do you want, what are your necessities? That question has not been answered by any executive officer, nor has

it been answered by any committee of this body. So, we have to grope in the dark as to what amount we need.

I say we were advised from the proper Department of the Government that the legislative department should heed this demand for more money. There has been in this body for thirteen years since I have been somewhat familiar with it in some capacity or another a very decided feeling that silver ought to be used as money in this country on equal terms with gold. That feeling has grown in this country, by examination and discussion, until there is now a general feeling, not confined to any class of men or section, that silver ought to be used as money on equal terms, as far as practicable, with gold. I know but one Senator in this body who denies that the demand for more money was a proper demand, one that ought to be heeded, to which we must respond. Senators who have heretofore been, if not the avowed supporters of the gold standard, at least in sympathy with the movement to make gold the standard, now tell us that we want silver as money.

Mr. President, it was believed in the early part of the present session of Congress that this universal demand coming up from all sections of the country alike would be heeded in the early legislation of this session, and the Secretary of the Treasury presented early his plan for the amelioration of the condition of public affairs. At his suggestion a bill was presented to the Senate and is found now in Senate bill 2350. This bill is labeled or spoken of abroad as a silver bill. We were told early when it came here, when we criticised it, that our criticisms were unfair, unjust, and ungenerous, because it was a silver bill and would raise the price of silver.

The idea appeared to have lodged in the minds of some men connected with the Treasury Department that the advocates of the use of silver as money were advocating it simply in order that silver might bring more when produced in this country. It is no answer to me when I object to the bill, to say, "It will put up the price of silver to 129," or that "it is a silver bill." If it should put up the price of silver to 150, the bill as introduced, as coming from the Secretary of the Treasury, would never receive my support. It must be apparent that silver put up in that way, without its full recognition as money, will not remain at the price at which it might be put by special effort.

We were told that the entire product of the American mines should be taken; that the American miner and the American citizen everywhere should be satisfied with that. Why, Mr. President, the American citizen has a right to draw upon all the resources of the world for money, if it is needed in his business. He is not confined to the production of the American mines of gold or silver. The automatic theory upon which we have been proceeding, and which is so dear to some men when it is applied to gold and so objectionable when applied to silver, goes upon the idea that a country can draw upon all the productive mines of the world and not draw upon its own alone. The bill goes upon the theory that we are to draw upon our own mines and our own alone and that all other mines are to be tabooed and their products kept out of circulation and degraded by our refusal to receive and use them.

A newidea in finance was adopted. Upon this purchase of the American bullion—for that is what it amounted to, although the bill did not say "purchase"—upon this deposit of American bullion in the mints there was to be issued a certificate. That certificate, under some conditions, could be exchanged for another certificate; but, without going through that, it is sufficient to treat it as a certificate that in the first instance demanded redemption at the hands of the Government. How should these certificates that were going out to do duty as money be paid? They were to be paid or redeemed in what? In coin? No! In bullion, in silver bullion, and tenaciously the Secretary of the Treasury has adhered to that view from that day to this.

Nothing else will suit the Secretary of the Treasury but a Treasury note or a certificate payable in a commodity. It is the first time, in the history of this country at least, that we have attempted to pay our debts in goods. It is the first time that the store system which we have heard of in the mining regions and in other sections of the country is to be applied to the Treasury Department of the United States; and with that suggestion I am told in the public prints—not by the Secretary, but in the public prints—that I am recreant to a high duty which I owe as a member of the Republican party that I do not support that absurd, that to my judgment wicked and nefarious proposition to redeem the public paper in a commodity.

Mr. President, this suggestion of the Secretary to pay these certificates in a commodity brought great satisfaction to a certain class of people in this country, that is, the advocates of the gold standard. They said, "That is the end of the coinage of silver; there is no longer any danger that you will get on a silver basis." Where are you going? On an absolute gold basis, without the use of silver as money. It is to be taken in as a commodity and taken out as a commodity and always treat it in the Treasury as a commodity, and yet they said, "Why, this is in the interest of silver; you silver men in the West who are interested in the production of silver ought to be satisfied, for it will put silver to par." Nobody knows better than the men who stood behind that scheme that it would not put silver to par, and nobody is more de-

terminated in this country than the men who fathered that suggestion that silver shall not go to par, and it never would under that scheme.

If they have fooled some people there are a great many in this country whom they have not been able to fool with that kind of a statement. They did not want to put silver to par. If they put silver to par its use as money will be assured. The whole world will take silver if it is put to par, and the men who demonetized silver in this country and who have steadily, against public sentiment and the public interest and the public demand, prevented its recoinage and its full circulation as money, are not now going to surrender the advantage which they have held for seventeen years; and I should regard myself as an imbecile, after the study I have given this subject, if I could not see what the purpose and object of that scheme is, or if I did not believe, at least, that I could see the purpose of alleging that they wanted to put silver at par, as far as they are concerned, with their interests the other way.

Mr. President, that scheme, as I said, met the approval of the gold monometallists everywhere. I have found one thing pretty safe in my practical life, that when my enemies want to do a particular thing and are anxious for it, look out. When I found all the monometallists everywhere singing praises to this bill, when I found the press that had been denouncing silver and denouncing every man who supported the free coinage or even the limited use of silver under the Bland bill as money supporting it, and all gold monometallists clapping their hands in glee over the prospect of this bill becoming a law, then I had reason to suspect that it was a Trojan horse. It was pretty certain, in a week, or I will say in a month, it was morally certain that that scheme could not succeed. The silver people—I do not mean by that the silver miners, I mean the silver people, I mean the political economists of the world who are not in league with the gold people, I mean the men who have studied finance for years and thought over it—condemned it—so far as this body is concerned practically abandoned it. Even the great influence that a Secretary of the Treasury can bring to bear upon matters of this kind could not keep it alive.

Then the Finance Committee, composed, as I now understand, of all silver men except one, for I believe each of its members, save one, claims that he is in favor of silver—I am not fully informed to what extent—presented another scheme which was said to be an improvement on the former, and it is, for it does not have in it the objectionable feature, the payment in goods. We were to buy \$4,500,000 of silver; and was that to be coined into money? Oh, no, Mr. President, not to be coined into money, but to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as a credit, upon which the Government of the United States was to issue its money, or the Treasury note was to be issued having no relation whatever to the coin in the Treasury, save and except that it had been given for the purchase of it, and the holder of it had no more claim on the bullion in the Treasury than any other citizen of the United States had or than he had upon any other property of the United States; and yet we were told that this was a silver bill, and that it was a bill in the interest of the use of silver as money, and that it ought to be satisfactory to us, inasmuch as it would raise the price of silver!

Why, Mr. President, I have not any doubt that it would raise the price of silver to some extent. It has not, I repeat, the vice in it that the other bill had, and it did look as if it was in the interest of silver to some extent, at least it was making a market for silver. Mr. President, if you want to put silver back to its original price of 1873 you have got more than to make a market for it; you have got to recognize its money function, you have got to treat it as a money metal. The Government may buy it and drop it in the sea where the depth is so great that human ingenuity and human cupidity can never reach it, and you will not put it back to par unless you recognize it as money. Nobody ought to doubt that.

The demand for silver must be a demand for it for the purpose for which it has been used for more than three thousand years, may more than five thousand years, and that is for money. That is its great value and that is its only real value. Compared to its moneyed use, all other uses are insignificant. Does this bill propose to use it as money? Does this bill come here with the recognition of the fundamental idea that it is money? On the contrary, the fundamental idea in this bill, as in the other, is that it is merchandise and nothing else. Under a contingency, I admit, by the kind will and good consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, some of it may be put into dollars; that is, the coinage of any part of the bullion so purchased is discretionary with the Secretary.

When I complain that I do not like this discretionary power in the Secretary of the Treasury I am told that that is a reflection upon our officials. Mr. President, I have been brought up in a political school that has taught me, and my observation has sustained the teaching, that that is the best law which leaves the least discretion to any human agent; that the best law is mandatory in all its provisions, in all its features. Of course I do not say that there are not exceptions to that rule, as there are to all others, but that is the principle upon which legislation must proceed, and that is especially the principle upon which financial legislation must proceed if it proceeds rightly.

Who determines the policy of the Government? The people. Who

determine that in the first instance for the people, subject to their revision? This body and the other that unites with us in legislation, and not the executive department, for they have no legislative power; they are to execute the law. Is it not clear that a bill which commits discretionary power to the Secretary of the Treasury over the finances of this country is not the proper one, to say the least?

Mr. President, going back a little, it was said that if we pay these certificates in bullion we could trust the Secretary of the Treasury not to abuse the discretion given to him. Admit that we may trust the present Secretary, do you know that we can trust the next one, whom we do not know? It is said that this is a power that he never would use, and if he did use it he would use it for the public good. Now, I do not think it would be offensive, nor do I think it would be unparliamentary, if I should stop a moment here to consider what has been the attitude of the several Secretaries of the Treasury with reference to the question of the use of silver as money. There has not been a Secretary of the Treasury since the Bland bill passed but has insisted that the Bland bill was a mistake. There has not been a Secretary of the Treasury that has not dinned this body and the other to repeal the Bland bill.

When less than eight millions of dollars were coined in this country under that act, or a little more perhaps than eight millions, but less than twenty millions, anyhow, the Secretary of the Treasury then advised the suspension of coinage, saying that we should surely reach a silver basis (of which some time I may more particularly and fully speak than now of its advantages and disadvantages)—we would surely reach a silver basis if we did not stop coining silver. At the next session of Congress, when less than \$50,000,000 had been coined, he said, "If you coin more than \$50,000,000 we shall go to a silver basis," and all the wise men of this body, and of the other, and of the country, who believed with him that the greatest possible calamity that could happen to a country would be to have plenty of silver, joined in the cry, "Suspend the coinage of silver."

There was no exception in the Administrations that preceded the last one, and when in the course of events there was a change of Administration the great dominant party that had had control of the finances of the country, that had shaped its financial policy through war and through difficulties unheard of in any other country, who had met and solved in some degree satisfactorily these problems that no other people had ever met—when they went out of office and a new Administration came in, with a constituency back of them universally in favor of silver, the new Administration out-Heroded Herod in their desire to get rid of silver. The President of the United States could not wait until he had taken the oath of office, but he addressed a letter to Congress, or to Congressmen, in which he demanded that we should get rid of the silver-coinage act at once; otherwise he declared we should be on a silver basis, and the gold obligations of the Government could not be met.

Sir, if he had searched with a search-warrant and with the power of a detective he could not have found an obligation of the United States save those that were specifically payable in gold—that is, gold certificates—that could not be paid by a silver dollar. The first message that came here from that Executive recommended the suspension of silver coinage; the report of his Secretary of the Treasury recommended the suspension of the silver coinage; the Treasurer recommended the suspension of the coinage; the Comptroller recommended it, and if the messengers and doorkeepers of the Department had had an opportunity to address Congress I have no doubt they would have been heard also demanding the suspension of the coinage of silver.

Mr. President, this Administration, in which I am glad to say I have an interest, was elected upon the solemn declaration made in our platform that we were in favor of the use of silver. No, we did not say that, but we said we were in favor of the use of silver as money, and every Senator here went on the stump, every member of the other body, and our speakers everywhere, and arraigned the Democratic party for its hostility to silver. The Democrats had, in deference to their candidate, left out of their platform any allusion to silver, notwithstanding, I will venture to say, if that question had been submitted to the convention that nominated Mr. Cleveland, there would not have been one dissenting voice out of fifty in favor of not simply the use of it, but of the free coinage of silver.

We made that contest upon the theory that the Republican party was in favor of silver as money, not to use it to make teapots, not to make teaspoons, not to make tablespoons, nor for subsidiary coin. When we said it was for money, we said it was for all purposes that money is used for. We said it was to be equal to gold. We said "We are in favor of the use of gold and silver as money," and we hold our power now by virtue of that declaration in our platform. So far as I am concerned I am loyal to that platform as I am to all platforms to which I subscribe, and I intend, so far as my voice is concerned, here and elsewhere to give it in favor of the use of silver as money in accordance with that platform, whether it parts me from the Administration or whether it does not.

Mr. President, I say here that this question of silver, the use of it as money, is not and never has been before a political question. It is a question too big to be made a party question. It is of too much vital

interest to the people of this country and it ought not to be made a party question. We put it in our platform, not as a party principle, but as one that pervaded the whole country in recognition of a universal demand in this country for the use of silver as money.

Mr. President, as to the bill before the Senate reported from the Committee on Finance, does it recognize the right of silver as money in the broad sense of the platform of the Republican party? Does it recognize silver in accordance with the general demand, as I think, of the country for its use? I think not. I have not given very much attention to the bill originally introduced in the Senate and for which the committee has provided these amendments, for the simple reason that I have supposed, and I will now assume so far as this part of the bill is concerned, that it is not in favor with any considerable number anywhere. If I thought it was, I should have occasion to go over some of its features and give some further reasons why the certificates ought not to be paid in silver bullion. I could show very readily the great danger of paying these certificates in bullion.

I believe, as was stated yesterday by the Senator from Nevada with reference to these certificates, that they would be used simply to take from the Treasury the silver there deposited and to send it across the sea. It would be making the Government of the United States but a warehouse for the deposit of silver. It would be a convenient place where the merchants of Great Britain could buy silver for India.

I know it will be said, and has been said to me over and over again, "You have no right to suppose that is so; you have no right to suppose a Secretary of the Treasury would use the power given to him in that provision to take from the Treasury any amount of silver except it was for the purpose of strengthening the Government, for the purpose of giving greater security to these notes." Why, Mr. President, with a hostile Secretary from the time the Bland bill was enacted up to to-day, every one of them religiously believing—because I have no desire to question their motives—that it is a crime to coin more silver, believing with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] that every dollar is but a 72-cent dollar (and we had that declaration from the predecessor of the present Secretary, that it was cheap money and inferior money and not worth its face in an official document), what else could they do but encourage the sending of this silver away to prevent its undue accumulation in the Treasury of the United States? They say its accumulation as dollars is injurious to the public credit and dangerous to the public morals! Would bullion be less dangerous?

Mr. President, under this bill these Treasury notes are to be receivable for public dues, but not for private dues. They can be put in the reserves of national banks of the country and held as money, for the only parties in the country that they are legal tender for are the banks. They are legal tender for the banks for the purpose of meeting the demands of the Government, but they are not legal tender in the hands of any citizen in the country. And when we say that the interests of the people are paramount to the interests of the banks, when we say that all the people of the United States are entitled to as good money as the banks are, to money that will discharge their indebtedness as readily as it will discharge the indebtedness of the banks, we are met with the statement that it is very doubtful whether the Government of the United States has the power to make a legal tender out of paper.

Mr. President, we have made legal tender out of paper. We made it in the early history of the war. We made our paper legal tender for the soldier and the sailor, and we made it legal tender for everybody except the Government and the banks and the bondholders. When the bill that was commonly called "the greenback bill" first came from the House of Representatives to this body it came here as a legal-tender bill with full force and effect, and the Government of the United States was bound to take the money issued under it as legal-tender paper for all dues. Then the question arose, not as to the right of the Government to make it legal tender between citizen and citizen, but as to the policy of making it legal tender as against the Government for public dues, and that was stricken out in the Senate and agreed to in the committee of conference, and thus it became legal tender for some purposes and not legal tender for others.

There never was a better illustration in the history of money of the ignorance that prevailed when that bill was passed. We were desiring to make good money. How do you make good money? By giving it all the functions of money. But here we withheld one of the principal functions for which money is used in this country, one of the principal uses of money in this country. We said, "You can pay certain debts with it and certain other ones you can not pay with it." Looking back now, does anybody doubt that if we had given those notes full legal-tender qualities they would have maintained themselves during the war? The Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] shakes his head. He doubts it, perhaps.

Of course, Mr. President, these are speculations. You can not tell what might have taken place. But there is one thing nobody will deny, that it would not have sunk so low as it did, because it had a valuable use in discharging the debt of one citizen to another. If it could have discharged another debt of great importance for which gold alone was used by the Government—that was the payment of duties on imports—it would have been better money than it was and would have retained something near its original status when it was issued.

Nobody can deny that. My own judgment is that all the \$400,000,000 issued of that money might have been kept at par with gold by proper management on the part of the Government had it been given full and complete legal-tender qualities.

Now, Mr. President, here comes this bill: certificates to be issued to discharge the duty of money. What is lacking in them? The power to discharge a debt; the very highest and most valuable function of money is withheld from them, and if they should depreciate as they will depreciate without that quality if issued in any great number, then we shall be told they have depreciated because the silver that has been put into the Treasury is not good enough security and the people have not faith in it, and we shall be told again that we shall have a cheap dollar, a dollar cheaper than the gold dollar.

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator from Colorado will allow me, I should like to ask him a question, because I am interested in the argument he is making.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly, I yield to a question.

Mr. GRAY. In speaking awhile ago of the fact that the legal-tender paper of the Treasury notes during the war and for a long time after were not at par with gold, the Senator attributed that fact to the limited legal-tender quality which belonged to them by law, that is, that they were not receivable for duties, and I believe that was the only restriction placed upon them. I ask him in that connection if he has reflected upon the present situation, to wit, that those same legal-tenders, and nearly the same amount, are at par with gold, and what is the reason that they are at par, although their legal-tender quality is still of that limited quantity?

Mr. TELLER. That is a mistake. By an order of the Secretary of the Treasury in 1879 they have been received ever since for public dues, and I can show the Senator from Delaware—I can take it out of my pocket, for I generally carry that with me—the last financial statement, showing exactly how many dollars of the revenues were collected in the different kinds of money, and the Senator will find that the greenback is received the same as gold.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator state in what proportion the receipts are in greenbacks?

Mr. TELLER. I will for the benefit of the Senator. I have it right here. The Treasury Department publishes a little statement showing the total receipts of the Government. The statement is headed No. 51, "A statement showing the monthly receipts from customs at New York from January, 1887, and the percentage of each kind of money received." Here are the several months. We will take January, 1887, and the United States notes received were 14.7 per cent. of the total. They were during the last month, April, 2.7 per cent.

Mr. GRAY. Of the total?

Mr. TELLER. Of the total.

Mr. ALDRICH. What percentage in gold?

Mr. TELLER. The gold coin in January, 1887, was nine-tenths of 1 per cent.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator please restate that?

Mr. TELLER. The gold coin received at New York in the month of January, 1887, was nine-tenths of 1 per cent.

Mr. GEORGE. Less than 1 per cent.?

Mr. TELLER. In February four-tenths of 1 per cent.; in March, eight-tenths; in April, 1.10. Now I will take January, 1889. In January, 1889, the first ten days the greenbacks paid in were 8.8 per cent.; the next ten days, 10.2 per cent, and the next ten days, 10.6 per cent. In January, 1890, the three periods being given of ten days each, there were received for the first period 4.3; for the second, 4.9, and for the third, 4.6. February was still less. These are United States notes.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly, though I should like to read a little more of this before I quit.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to have the Senator state how much was in gold.

Mr. MORRILL. I should like to have the Senator state also that there was no law passed compelling the Secretary of the Treasury to receive the notes, but when they rose to par he thought it was saving the importers of New York and other places some inconvenience to take the Treasury notes and go to the subtreasury and get the gold and then pay the duties?

Mr. GRAY. That was the very question I wanted to ask the Senator from Colorado, whether, in his opinion, the order of the Secretary of the Treasury making Treasury notes receivable for customs duties brought the notes to par with gold, or whether, having passed the resumption act that went into effect January 1, 1879, thereby making the Treasury notes at par with gold, it is not a mere convenience to use the money that is convertible into the other at the option of the holder.

Mr. TELLER. I think I am perfectly familiar with that.

Mr. GRAY. I think the Senator is more familiar with it than I am.

Mr. TELLER. I was quite aware before the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] informed me that there was no statute upon the subject, but that these notes were taken by order of the Secretary of the Treasury, and they were not taken by an order of the Secretary of the

Treasury until they were practically at par, or perhaps I may say actually, at par with gold. Before the 1st day of January, 1879, when resumption by law commenced, resumption had taken effect and there was nothing done on the 1st day of January, 1879, that had not been done before except that the Government held itself out ready to pay gold for greenbacks which the banks had been doing and were glad to do for many months.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Senator able to inform us whether the greenbacks were paid on the public debt or whether the public creditors received greenbacks instead of gold for their interest?

Mr. TELLER. I understand that on demand at the Department if a creditor prefers greenbacks he gets greenbacks and if he prefers gold he gets gold, and if he is away they send him a draft and he takes that to a Government office and he gets there whatever he wants.

Mr. GRAY. That is a pretty good condition of finance.

Mr. TELLER. It is a good condition of finance. I am not finding any fault with that.

Mr. McPHERSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. TELLER. I will yield to the Senator for a question, but I know the Senator's method of making a speech when he asks a question, and I agreed to quit in about an hour.

Mr. McPHERSON. I promise the Senator not to make a speech.

Mr. TELLER. I will yield to a question.

Mr. McPHERSON. The Senator says the Treasury pays all creditors in the money they demand. That I believe to be true. If the Treasury were in a condition to force silver upon the creditor, I want to know what would be the condition then as between the silver coin and the gold coin?

Mr. TELLER. How is that?

Mr. McPHERSON. If the Treasury, by reason of a surplus of silver and the absence of gold, should be compelled to pay the creditor in silver, instead of any money that he wanted or asked for, would not then gold be at a premium and would not the public outside begin to look out for themselves?

Mr. TELLER. Gold is at a premium now, and that is exactly what we are complaining about. That is just exactly the trouble with this country and with the world. Gold is at a premium of more than 30 per cent. of what it was when we demonetized silver, at a premium over everything on the face of the earth.

I will answer the Senator's question. That is just what the Government does to-day. The Government has more than three hundred millions of paper out that is payable in silver, and it has never paid a dollar of it in gold and will not pay a dollar of it in gold if the holder demands it, but pays it in silver.

I heard it outside the Senate the other day that the way the silver certificates were kept at par was that the Government would and did redeem them in gold. I have an authoritative statement from the Secretary of the Treasury that not a dollar has ever been redeemed in gold, but they have always been and are redeeming at all times in silver, and they are as good everywhere as a gold dollar, as good in Great Britain as a gold dollar, as good in Germany as a gold dollar, as good in Canada as a gold dollar, and certainly as good in the hands of the American people, and they are redeemable in silver and are redeemed in practice in silver and in nothing else.

Mr. McPHERSON. Will the Senator yield to me for one small question?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly I yield for a question.

Mr. McPHERSON. I think, if I remember correctly, the debate of 1878, in which the Senator from Colorado took a very active part—

Mr. TELLER. Not much.

Mr. McPHERSON. A declaration made, I think, by that Senator, certainly by almost every Senator upon the floor, that if they thought the then pending bill would not have the effect to bring silver back in value to its former status they would be disinclined to vote for the bill. At that time silver was at 8 per cent. discount. We have taken two millions a month of silver bullion which has made more than two millions a month of silver dollars, and we have used it in our coinage, and the price of silver bullion has fallen since that time 20 per cent. more. Now, if I understand the Senator aright, he proposes, instead of any limit upon the use of silver, to go into the free coinage of silver when there has been 20 per cent. reduction in its value since we remonetized it.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, that is not a question, but that is a speech of the Senator.

Mr. McPHERSON. I want to know if the Senator proposes—

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me to proceed, I will say it is a good deal like a lawyer I knew once, who, when he had heard the judge charge the jury, as they do in some States, rather severely against his client, was asked what he thought of the charge. He said he did not call that a charge at all, but he called it an unfair summing up. [Laughter.] So what the Senator has said is not a question, but it is an unfair statement. If, however, the Senator will allow me to go on I will answer it.

The Senator never heard me say, either in a public or a private speech—and he may hunt the RECORD, and when he does I will give it

up—that two millions a month coinage would put silver at par, put it up. That bill was as illogical and as absurd as the present proposed makeshift is. It was dallying with the question, and was not the plan of the silver people.

Why did we not go to free coinage? Simply because Senators like the Senator from New Jersey assuming that they knew all about what would be the current of events in the future said if you take free coinage foreign silver will flood this country and we can not take care of it, but if you will take two millions a month that will put it to par. It is the Senator from New Jersey and his coadjutors who made that statement, and not I. I never supposed it would put silver to par. I thought it would do what the world sees now it did do, that it would sustain in some respects silver and prevent its great fall. It was so said before the English commission by all the scientists who testified, without a solitary exception, that but for the Bland bill silver would be lower than it is now, and when Mr. Comber, I think, one of the intelligent gold men, was asked what he thought about that, he said that the Bland bill helped, but it had not been sufficient to sustain it. That is all there is about it, and the Senator from New Jersey can not find, if I recollect the debate, a single Senator who was a silver man who expressed his belief that two millions a month would put silver to par.

We advocated free coinage. We said perhaps \$4,000,000 a month may put it up. We said so again and again, but we have not been able to get the Treasury Department to try it. Why? Simply because there has never been a Secretary of the Treasury, except it might have been a few months when somebody was accidentally there, but there has been no man in charge of that Department for any considerable length of time who has not been determined that silver should not go to par, and anything that would put it to par he was opposed to.

Mr. BLAIR. If, as the Senator claims, free coinage would put silver up to par, why would not the coinage of \$2,000,000 a month put it up some?

Mr. TELLER. Two million dollars a month did put it up. It sustained it. In another part of my speech, if I can be permitted to make it in consecutive order, I shall touch upon that question. I promised to give an opportunity for an executive session, and when I touch upon a few other things I propose to leave the matter until to-morrow.

I want to go back to the statement I was making when I was interrupted by the question of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], not wishing to decline to answer it, and I want to call attention to the amount of silver certificates that are paid in.

I recollect the debate of 1878, when I was a member of this body, and it was a matter of some interest to the people of my State, and I remember very distinctly that the Senator from Vermont who sits now in front of me, chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. MORRILL], thought that if these certificates were received for public dues everybody would grab for them and the result would be that all the dues would be paid in silver, and so he offered an amendment which can be found in the RECORD that they should not be received or that only a certain portion of the dues should be paid in silver certificates—a quarter, I think, was the first, and then something else, and so on, saying that there would be such a desire to get rid of them that everybody would put them into the Government coffers and they would always return to the Government, and the Government would get nothing but silver; and I believe Mr. Cleveland had that same trouble in his mind, and Mr. Manning had it in his mind when they first came into office.

They said we were threatened with the increased mintage of silver, with such a redundancy of silver certificates that the people would not want them and they would come into the Treasury in payment of duties on imports, and the Government would have no gold with which to meet its obligations. Let us see how much we have received since 1887. That is as far as I have got the statement.

In January, 1887, there were 16.2 per cent. of silver certificates; in February, 10.1; in March, 11.4. These are the silver certificates paid in for duties on imports that thus found their way back to the Treasury. In July, 1888, these fell to 8.3 per cent.; in August, to 5.5 per cent.; in September, to 4.4 per cent.; in October, to 3.6 per cent.; in November, to 5.4 per cent.; in January, 1889, to 6.2 per cent.; in February, to 5.3 per cent.; and in April, 1890, to 1.6 per cent.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to know what percentage of these silver certificates could have been paid in by the permission of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. TELLER. All of them.

Mr. GEORGE. The whole duty could have been paid in that way?

Mr. TELLER. All could have been paid in silver certificates. The payments in gold certificates were as follows: In January, 1887, 67.8 per cent.; in February, 74.2 per cent.; in January, 1888, 77.6 per cent.; in February, 75.8 per cent.; in January, 1890, 92.5 per cent.; in April, 95.4 per cent.; and, so far in May, 94.9 per cent.

Mr. President, a Senator asks me the explanation of that. I suppose the explanation is that the gold certificates are largely kept in New York. They do not circulate as money; they are in large denominations, there being now in actual existence \$90,000,000 of gold certifi-

ates that are either of the denomination of five or ten thousand dollars each, and it is simply a question of convenience. Gold is not, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] said yesterday, in circulation in this country to any considerable extent. I do not deny that it is doing duty as money to some extent, but it is not in general circulation.

Before I leave this subject—because when I commence again I desire to take up another feature of the bill—I want to call the attention of those who are in favor of increasing the circulation and who believe it ought to be increased, to one provision in this bill as it is reported by the Finance Committee which I think is dangerous.

The certificates are redeemable, according to this bill, in lawful money. They are not legal tender; they can not perform the highest money duty; they can not discharge debts. "Oh," it is said, "everybody will take them." Mr. President, everybody will take them when they do not need the legal-tender quality; everybody will take them when business is all right. But what you need the legal-tender quality for is the time of distress, of financial convulsions and panics.

I have heard it said recently that there has been no trouble about legal tenders. We people of the West know better. I have seen in the State in which I live telegrams to send legal tender from Omaha by special train to Denver more than once. I know two parties left New York with the legal tenders for the city of Denver in 1873 to meet demands for legal tender during the panic of that year. Why should this not be legal tender for all parts of the country? These notes are practically legal tender for New York City, for Philadelphia, and for the city of Washington, because they have a Government agency with money stored of a legal-tender character to which they can go and exchange their certificates for legal tenders, but in the city of Denver, in the city of Omaha, in Kansas City, no man can exchange these certificates for legal tenders, and if he wants legal tenders he is at the mercy of banks that have them, or more likely the banks will not have them and he is at the mercy of his creditor.

Can anybody give me any reason why this certificate should not be a legal tender? There are constitutional objections, I am told. The Supreme Court of the United States has twice decided that we were able to make legal tender in our judgment.

Mr. REAGAN. On our naked promise.

Mr. TELLER. On our naked promise, without a dollar back of it. It is too late for anybody to stand here and say, "I object to the legal-tender quality of these bills because of a constitutional doubt." It is a power that is potent here and it is potent everywhere in this country, that has dominated legislation in the interest of capital, and it is that power which stands back and says "You can not make this legal tender." Why, we do not need it as legal tender in New York. It is good enough for us, it is held in the bank reserved. We can go to the Treasury or subtreasury and can get legal tender. Any bill that gets my vote will have a legal-tender clause, and I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], who charges that this is a caucus bill, that even a caucus can not make me vote for a bill upon a money question that I believe is inimical to the great interests of the people of the United States.

The certificates or notes are to be used to buy bullion. There are two classes of people interested in this bill. One class feel that they want silver to go up and they have a special interest in that. The other class say they want more money, that everything else may go up. You want to make this money as good as it can be made, and the Secretary is to buy silver at the market price with these notes—where?

In the bill introduced in another body it says "the markets of the world." That is what the Secretary will do, buy in the markets of the world, and what he has been doing under the Bland bill. He has been inquiring what has been the price of silver in Hamburg, what the price of silver in London, what the price of silver in New York, but he never bought it on New York prices; he bought it on the London price less transportation. All Secretaries of the Treasury have bought it that way, and that is what they will do again; so it will be the price in London or Hamburg that will fix the price of the bullion bought, although, of course, the New York price may be taken.

If these Treasury notes lack the confidence of the people and they depreciate the eighth of 1 per cent., if they go down at all, there will not be a dollar of silver bought; nobody will take them and give silver of the market price. The certificates or notes are to be practically used in this country, and if they depreciate then silver must go up in order to meet that depreciation. Then the price of silver in this country will be higher than it is abroad, and no silver will be bought at all, and that, in my judgment, is what commends this bill to the consideration of a great class of men who are clamoring for its passage to-day, who are the opponents of silver, and who declare we need no more money.

Mr. President, I am not mistaken when I say that the dominant class in this country in finance—the creditor class—do not want any legislation that shall put silver up, nor do they want any legislation that shall give to the country more money. Why? They have studied the financial question, and they understand that it is the number of units that determines the value of money, and they say: "The number is great enough now; we want to stand where we are; we do not want any more." And the whole influence of that class of men will be to

put down the value of these certificates that they may be below the gold value, and then they will buy no bullion here or anywhere else, and there will be a practical suspension of bullion purchase and a practical suspension of the issue of money under this bill.

Mr. President, should this bill meet with favor and become a law it will be possible to put silver up in the markets to par. A combination can be made to suspend the coinage of silver in this country, with untold capital. Millions and millions of money can be aggregated to destroy silver as money in this country, and of that I shall speak later on. All the great interests that hold the credits of this country, amounting to nobody knows how much, are interested in having what some of the Senators here have been in the habit of calling "the best kind of a dollar," and if they can destroy silver by putting silver to par they will do it, and if it is put up to par for one hour that is the end of this bill, and then the special agencies that put it up will be interested in putting it down. There is no provision if silver goes down that there shall be any further purchases. The Secretary stops when silver goes to par, and could not, if he would, buy more. I do not mean to say that the committee anticipated that that would be done. I do not charge anything upon the committee. I charge nothing upon any member of this Senate, either now or in the past, but I simply say that this can be done, and, this being so, it is a dangerous bill, either for the men who want to put up the price of silver or the men who want to increase the circulation of this country.

Mr. President, I promised the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] that I would yield for an executive session, and, if it is agreeable to the Senate, I will yield now and go on later with my remarks, or resume to-morrow, as shall be the pleasure of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. INGALLS. I move that the Senate do now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

NORTHERN CHEYENNE INDIANS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication of the 10th instant from the Secretary of the Interior, and the accompanying copies of correspondence relative to the condition of the Northern Cheyenne Indians at the Pine Ridge agency, South Dakota.

The desire of these Indians to be united upon some common reservation with their brethren now occupying the Tongue River reserve in Montana is quite natural, and such an arrangement would, I think, promote the best interests of both of these bands.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 13, 1890.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the following committee appointments:

Mr. SANDERS on the Select Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands;

On the Committee on Improvement of the Mississippi River, in place of Mr. HAWLEY, excused;

On the Committee on Enrolled Bills, in place of Mr. QUAY, excused; and

On the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, in place of Mr. ALLISON, excused.

Mr. POWER on the Committee on Immigration, in place of Mr. PETTIGREW, excused;

On the Committee on Railroads, in place of Mr. SAWYER, excused;

On the Committee on Revolutionary Claims, in place of Mr. DIXON, excused; and

On the Select Committee on the Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, in place of Mr. MANDERSON, excused.

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is entitled to the floor on the unfinished business.

Mr. INGALLS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be informally laid aside until to-morrow, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Calendar of unobjected cases under Rule VIII.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (S. 1221) granting a pension to Helen Plunkett.

The message also announced that the House had non-concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4863) granting a pension to John Carter, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MORRILL, Mr. LAWS, and Mr. MARTIN of Indiana the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had non-concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5206) granting a pension to Catlena Lyman, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BELKNAP, and Mr. LANE the managers at the conference on the part of the House.

RED LAKE AND WESTERN RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The first bill in order on the Calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 3314) granting right of way to the Red Lake and Western Railway and Navigation Company across Red Lake reservation, in Minnesota, and granting said company the right to take lands for terminal railroad and warehouse purposes was announced as first in order on the Calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. DAWES. I move to amend the bill by striking out the words "Secretary of the Interior" and inserting "President;" in section 3, line 19; so as to read:

As the President shall prescribe.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 3, line 19, before the word "shall," it is proposed to strike out the words "Secretary of the Interior" and insert "President;" so as to read:

That before these privileges shall become operative the consent of a majority of the male adults of the said Red Lake Chippewa Indians shall be obtained in such form and manner as the President shall prescribe:

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. After the word "direct," in section 1, line 16, I move to insert the words "not less than \$1.25 per acre" and to strike out, beginning in line 14, the words "the sum of not less than \$1.25 per acre, or;" so as to read:

Upon paying to the United States, for the use of the Red Lake band of Chippewa Indians, as soon as the said right of way is located, and the plats thereof approved by the Secretary of the Interior, such sum as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, not less than \$1.25 per acre for each and every acre which shall be used and occupied, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. In section 2, line 11, after the word "Indians," I move to strike out "the sum of \$1.25 for each and every acre thereof, or" and to insert, after the words "may direct," in line 14, the words "not less than the sum of \$1.25 for each and every acre thereof," just really transposing the language.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 2, line 11, after the word "Indians," it is proposed to strike out the words "the sum of \$1.25 for each and every acre thereof, or," and after the word "direct," in line 14 of the same section, to insert "not less than the sum of \$1.25 for each and every acre thereof;" so as to read:

Upon paying to the United States for the use of said Indians such sum as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, not less than the sum of \$1.25 for each and every acre thereof; also whatever amount may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior for such right, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT COMMISSIONS.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3479) to provide for the issuing and recording of commissions in the Department of the Treasury. It is for the convenience of the Treasury Department, asked for by that Department, and unanimously reported by the Committee on Finance. It will only take the time to read it. It is a very brief bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRELL. If it is not to be a precedent for setting aside the unanimous consent that was given, I will consent to it.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

It provides that hereafter the commissions of all officers in the Department of the Treasury of the United States, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, heretofore prepared at the Department of State, upon the requisition of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be made out and recorded in the Department of the Treasury, and shall be under the seal of that Department and countersigned by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS IN THE DISTRICT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next bill in order on the Calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 266) to encourage co-operation and to provide for the formation of associations in the District of Columbia for the purpose of

conducting any lawful business and dividing the profits among the members thereof was announced as the next bill on the Calendar.

Mr. INGALLS. The author and promoter of that bill is absent. I think that he should be here to explain its provisions and the amendments when it is up for consideration, and I ask that it may be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

SAMUEL TATE.

The bill (S. 152) for the relief of Samuel Tate was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, in line 5, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred and forty-four;" and after the word "dollars" to strike out "and fifty cents;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Samuel Tate \$1,000, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full satisfaction for the rent of his house in what is known as the Gayoso block in the city of Memphis, Tenn., for three months and thirteen days, from the 30th of May, 1865, to the 13th of September, 1865, at the rate of \$333.33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per month, the contract price agreed upon on the 13th of September, 1865.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

The bill (S. 3324) for improving the Mississippi River from the Head of the Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. INGALLS. I notice that the Senator who reported that bill is not in his seat. I suggest that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. DOLPH. Last Saturday I was requested by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON], if the bill was reached in his absence, to ask that it go over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

H. J. CHENEY.

The bill (S. 557) for the relief of H. J. Cheney was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to H. J. Cheney, of Nashville, Tenn., superintendent of the registry department in the post-office at Nashville, \$621.68, the amount stolen in registered letters from his office in the post-office building, without neglect or fault of his, on the 4th of May, 1887, and by him promptly and fully accounted for to the Government.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CANCELLATION OF PENSION CERTIFICATES.

The bill (S. 216) to prevent the summary cancellation of pension certificates and providing for a hearing in cases relating thereto was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. GORMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

UNDERFLOW WATERS IN THE WEST.

The bill (S. 3346) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to cause to be made all necessary field examinations, surveys, and experiments for the purpose of demonstrating the extent, etc., with reference to irrigation, of the underflow waters between the ninety-seventh degree of west longitude and the foot-hills of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, and making an appropriation therefor was announced as next on the Calendar.

Mr. GORMAN. Let that bill go over also.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MOODY] who reported that bill is not in the Chamber, and I suggest that it be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

OREGON PAVING AND CONTRACT COMPANY.

The bill (S. 633) for the relief of the Oregon Paving and Contract Company was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to add the following proviso:

Provided, That said company shall have no claim against the Government for any moneys whatever under such contract.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. INGALLS. Let the report be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. MITCHELL April 1, 1890:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred bill (S. 633) for the relief of the Oregon Paving and Contract Company, having had the same under consideration, beg respectfully to submit the following report:

The facts in this case are fully stated in a report heretofore made by this committee in the first session of the Fiftieth Congress (Report No. 1770), and your committee reaffirm the same and report the bill back and recommend its passage.

The report is as follows:

"To the members of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:
"The undersigned petitioners do hereby respectfully petition your honorable body to be released from a certain contract to furnish stone for improving the mouth of the Columbia River, Oregon, entered into by and between ourselves and Capt. Charles F. Powell, United States Engineers, as per advertisement and specification herewith attached. In accordance with No. 1, 'Instructions for bidders,' we submitted samples of stone, and gave notice that we proposed quarrying the stone at a place known as Tongue Point, from which place we obtained the sample exhibited. At the time we commenced the prospects were considered by all as quite flattering, and the stone came out in excellent dimensions. We went to a great deal of expense securing a plant and fitting up for active operations, believing we could at this place get all the rock required. We had not progressed far with the work when the stone was found to be too much broken to fill the requirement of the specifications, and it was rejected by the assistant engineer in charge. After trying in vain to get out large stone, we were compelled to abandon said quarry at Tongue Point, with all our improvements.

"In order to fill the contract we prospected at different places along the river for a distance of 100 miles above Fort Stevens, but found no stone to fill the specifications, and were compelled to quit work altogether. On the 30th of November, 1887, we wrote Captain Powell, asking to be released from said contract, which was referred to the Department at Washington. Since then we have been hunting and prospecting for a quarry in order to commence work before April 15th ultimo, and had about completed arrangements, when we learned the rock from the proposed quarry would not be satisfactory. We failed to secure a quarry that was likely to produce rock according to the requirements before the 15th of April, and telegraphed for an extension of time, which has not yet been granted. We have done what we could to complete our contract, but failed because the stone we agreed to furnish could not be gotten out in pieces large enough to be satisfactory, and not from any fault of ours. For the foregoing reasons we ask your honorable body to relieve us from said contract, and we will ever pray, etc.

"OREGON PAVING AND CONTRACT COMPANY,
"JAMES STEEL, President,
"DAVID STEEL, Secretary.

[SEAL.]

"PORTLAND, OREGON, May 29, 1888."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is it desired by the Senator from Kansas that the specifications of the engineers shall be read?

Mr. INGALLS. It is not necessary that the specifications and special instructions should be read. I observe, however, that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], who reported this bill, is absent from the Chamber.

Mr. DOLPH. I hope the Senator will not ask to have the bill passed over.

Mr. INGALLS. I should like to have some explanation as to the reason for the action that the Senate is invited to take in this matter.

Mr. DOLPH. I think it can be stated in a word.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The recommendation of the committee will be read as a part of the report.

The Secretary read as follows:

Your committee, while not disposed to favor the cancellation of contracts, nor yet, as a general rule, to authorize the Secretary of War to do so, are, in view of the great hardships presented in this case, disposed to make it an exception, and therefore report back the bill (S. 633) with the following amendment, and recommend its passage:

Add to the bill the following: "Provided, Said company shall have no claim against the Government for any moneys whatever under such contract."

Mr. DOLPH. It is simply the case of a company that contracted to furnish stone and material for a jetty. They failed to find stone that met the requirements of the contract, and the Government proceeded to procure its own quarry and provide its own means of transportation and furnish the stone itself. The Government would not now receive any material under the contract.

Mr. DAWES. Was the Government put to any expense or loss under this contract?

Mr. DOLPH. Presumably the Government furnished the stone themselves from their own quarry and with their own appliances cheaper than they could contract for it. I do not understand that the Government was put to any loss or any expense. These parties simply failed, and the bill as reported provides that they shall receive nothing under their contract. It simply authorizes the Secretary of War to cancel the contract under such conditions as he may impose. That is all there is of it. It seems to be eminently fair. As a matter of fact I have understood the Chief of Engineers—

Mr. DAWES. Does the bill require that the parties may be awarded indemnity for the loss?

Mr. DOLPH. I have no doubt it may be done under that provision.

Mr. DAWES. Should there not be a provision that the contract should only be canceled upon indemnity to the United States?

Mr. DOLPH. I think not. I have had frequent conversation with officers of the Government in regard to the bond and deposits put up before contracts, and in regard to these contracts for furnishing material, and I have yet to learn of a case where the Government has prosecuted and procured damages for the failure of such a contract. I know of a good many cases where the Committee on Claims has reported for partial payment where there has been such failure. I think this is as fair as anything could be, leaving it to the Secretary of War to determine on what terms the contracts shall be canceled and allowing the parties nothing for any expenditure.

Mr. INGALLS. It certainly would be establishing a very injurious precedent if it were to be understood that contractors who make a hard bargain, when they find that they are liable to sustain a loss, are to be discharged without indemnifying the Government. Here it seems that these parties contracted to deliver certain stone that was to be used for

the improvement at the mouth of the Columbia River. They were presumably intelligent men. They were aware of the terms and conditions under which the stone was to be supplied. They undertook the performance of the contract. Subsequently they discovered that in consequence of the distance and the character of the stone in the quarry they could not carry out their contract without a loss. Of course, when they failed the Government was compelled to take the work on its own account. We are not informed whether this was upon terms less or greater than those that had been accepted by the contractor. We are entirely without information on this subject; and while I have not any doubt about the action of the Committee on Claims, yet in the way of precedent it certainly would be injurious to have it understood that a contractor can make a bargain, and if it is a losing one have it canceled and if it is a good one hold on to it.

Mr. DOLPH. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. INGALLS. Certainly.

Mr. DOLPH. I recollect having reported myself, with the approval of the entire committee, a bill making an additional allowance for a man who had contracted to dredge one of the harbors on the Atlantic coast, in one of the Southern States, because he had discovered after the contract was made that the dredging was hard-pan or blue clay instead of soft clay. In this case the engineer and the contractor, both parties, expected that the quarry from which the stone was to be furnished would furnish the stone, but after they had partially used it they found that the stone was not of a quality to be received. Both parties were deceived, and I can not conceive that there is anything inequitable or unjust to the Government in allowing the Secretary of War to say what should be done in regard to the contract.

Mr. INGALLS. But the Secretary does not say it. There is no recommendation of the Secretary on file. It is not pretended that the Secretary of War has reported upon the case.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask that the provision of the bill on that subject be read.

Mr. INGALLS. I refer to the report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to cancel a certain contract entered into by and between the Oregon Paving and Contract Company, of the one part, and Capt. Charles F. Powell, United States engineer, acting for and on behalf of the United States, of the other part, and dated the 2d day of June, A. D. 1887, whereby said Oregon Paving and Contract Company contracted to furnish a certain amount of stone of certain dimensions to be used in the improvement of the mouth of the Columbia River, Oregon, on such terms as he may deem equitable and just: Provided, That said company shall have no claim against the Government for any moneys whatever under such contract.

Mr. DAWES. I suggest to the Senator from Oregon, to make it absolutely fair both ways, to put in "not exceeding full indemnity to the United States for any loss sustained."

Mr. DOLPH. I would not like to do that. The bill is a measure that I have not given any special attention to. If there is any objection to what seems to me so equitable and fair as the provisions of this bill, I should rather submit to the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas and allow it to go over until my colleague is here.

Mr. DAWES. I do not wish to interfere with the passage of the bill.

Mr. INGALLS. Let the bill go over until the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] returns.

Mr. ALLISON. That is the best way.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

MAJ. G. C. GOODLOE.

The bill (S. 3261) for the relief of Maj. G. C. Goodloe was announced as next in order.

Mr. INGALLS. I observe that the Senator who reported this bill is absent from the Chamber. Perhaps it might be well to pass it over until he came in.

Mr. BATE. He was here just now.

Mr. BLAIR. I suggest whether there is a quorum present. If there are to be no bills passed or discussed or anything done, I want to ascertain whether there is a quorum here.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

Mr. DAWES. I appeal to the Senator to withdraw that request, and I will ask the Senate to consider a bill to which there can be no objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

Mr. DAWES. I ask the Senator to withdraw the request.

Mr. INGALLS. The rule is imperative.

Mr. HARRIS. When the absence of a quorum is suggested the roll must be called.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allison,	Casey,	Davis,	Gorman,
Barbour,	Cockrell,	Dawes,	Harris,
Bate,	Coke,	Dolph,	Hawley,
Blackburn,	Colquitt,	Edmunds,	Hearst,
Blair,	Cullom,	Frye,	Higgins,
Call,	Daniel,	George,	Hiscock,

Hoar,
Ingalls,
Jones of Arkansas,
Jones of Nevada,
McMillan,

Pasco,
Payne,
Platt,
Pugh,
Quay,

Sanders,
Sawyer,
Sherman,
Squire,
Teller,

Vance,
Walthall,
Wilson of Iowa,
Wilson of Md.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have responded to their names. A quorum is present.

The bill (S. 3261) for the relief of Maj. G. C. Goodloe, paymaster of the United States Marine Corps, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to direct the accounting officers of the Treasury to adjust the account of G. C. Goodloe, paymaster of the Marine Corps, and credit him with \$3,333.31, for losses incurred in his office of paymaster of the Marine Corps, without negligence or fault on his part, through the forgeries and malfeasance of Benjamin A. Jones, late a clerk in the office, which sum stands now charged against Goodloe at the Treasury Department.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRUSTEES OF NAVAL ACADEMY.

The bill (S. 192) providing for the appointment of a board of trustees for the United States Naval Academy was announced as next in order.

Mr. INGALLS. I notice that the Senator who reported that bill is not in his seat or in the Chamber, so far as I can observe. Perhaps it had better go over until he returns.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

ALEXANDER W. BALDWIN.

The bill (S. 170) to refund illegal internal-revenue tax collected of the late Alexander W. Baldwin as United States district judge for the district of Nevada, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to refund to the estate of Alexander W. Baldwin, late United States district judge for the district of Nevada, \$624.59, being the internal-revenue tax illegally collected on his salary.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to hear the report read in that case.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, April 2, 1890:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 170) to refund illegal internal-revenue tax collected of the late Alexander W. Baldwin, as United States district judge for the district of Nevada, have examined the same and respectfully report:

A bill similar to this was introduced into the Senate during the Fiftieth Congress, referred to its Committee on Claims, and reported favorably by that committee and passed by the Senate. That report is hereto subjoined, and is adopted by your committee as the basis of another favorable report and recommendation that said bill be passed.

REPORT IN FIFTIETH CONGRESS.

It appears by the annexed communication from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that the sum of \$624.59 was withheld from Baldwin's salary as internal-revenue tax from March 11, 1865, to November 4, 1869, and that the same, or any part thereof, has not been refunded.

As said tax was illegal and unconstitutional, your committee report back the bill (which provides for its refunding) favorably and recommend its passage.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE, Washington, August 6, 1888.

SIR: In reply to yours of the 2d instant you are informed that by Ex. Doc. No. 363, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, page 49, it appears that there is due from the United States to Alexander W. Baldwin a balance of \$624.59.

The records of this office show that this amount is represented by Treasury draft No. 945, on internal-revenue warrant No. 4731, Pt., dated August 11, 1873.

Alexander W. Baldwin was a United States district judge for the district of Nevada, and the sum of \$624.59 is the aggregate amount withheld from his salary from March 11, 1865, to November 4, 1869, under section 123, act of June 30, 1864, as per certificate furnished by the Acting First Comptroller, May 14, 1872.

Neither Judge Baldwin nor his legal representatives, so far as the records of this office show, ever made a demand for the refunding of this amount. The amount had been unconstitutionally withheld from Judge Baldwin's salary, and the certificate furnished by the Acting First Comptroller was, as had been done in cases of other United States judges whose compensation could "not be diminished during their continuance in office," made the basis of a claim for the refunding of the tax so withheld.

The claim was allowed in this office and draft 945 issued in payment thereof, but as Judge Baldwin's representative was unknown to this office the draft was never forwarded.

On the 29th of March, 1877, Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue Rogers transmitted this draft with others to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury, with the following statement: "The ten drafts first named were drawn for the purpose of refunding certain taxes erroneously withheld, as shown by a statement prepared by the First Comptroller at the request of this office, from the parties in whose favor they were drawn, as tax on their salaries as United States judges. The parties have never applied for the drafts, and as they never applied to have the amounts which were withheld from their salaries refunded, it would appear that, as the taxes were all withheld prior to June 6, 1872, their applications would, if now presented, be barred by section 3224, Revised Statutes."

The inclosures of your letter of the 2d instant are herewith returned.

Respectfully yours,

JOS. S. MILLER, Commissioner.

Hon. W. M. STEWART,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WATER SUPPLY ON PUBLIC LANDS.

The bill (S. 2104) to provide for the conservation and use of the natural water supplies upon certain portions of the public lands of the United States, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not think we can consider that bill this evening. I hope the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] will not insist upon it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice, ASSIGNEES OF JOHN ROACH.

The bill (S. 1160) for the relief of George W. Quintard and George E. Weed, assignees of John Roach, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. INGALLS. I do not see the Senator who reported that bill in his seat. Perhaps it had better be passed over until his return.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF NEWTON, MASS.

The bill (S. 182) for the relief of the First National Bank of Newton, Mass., was announced as next in order.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator who reported this bill does not appear to be in the Chamber. I suggest that it be passed over until he comes in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

SAMUEL D. HARPER.

The bill (S. 1506) granting relief to Samuel D. Harper was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to insert at the end of the bill the words "and grant him an honorable discharge of date August 13, 1865;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to remove the charge of desertion now standing on the rolls of the Army against the name of Samuel D. Harper, late a private in Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and now a resident of Humeston, Wayne County, Iowa, and grant him an honorable discharge of date August 13, 1865.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NORFOLK COUNTY FERRY COMMITTEE.

The bill (S. 471) for the relief of the Norfolk County Ferry Committee was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to the Norfolk County Ferry Committee, of Norfolk, Va., \$42,300, that being the amount collected by the Quartermaster's Department of the Army as tolls and ferriages for the transportation of civilians, their animals and freights, for three years and eleven months, excepting eight days, beyond the current expenses and repairs of the ferry, as found by the Court of Claims.

Mr. INGALLS. Let the report be read, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report, submitted by Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, April 3, 1890.

Mr. INGALLS. I have examined the report in this case and find that the amount that is claimed has been practically awarded or certified by the Court of Claims.

Mr. PASCO. That is true.

Mr. INGALLS. I withdraw my request for the further reading of the report.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN H. JONES AND THOMAS D. HARRIS.

The bill (S. 1666) for the relief of the legal representatives of John H. Jones and Thomas D. Harris was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, in line 5, after the word "to," to insert "the legal representatives of;" in line 6, after the name "John H. Jones," to insert "formerly;" in the same line, after "Ohio," to insert "deceased;" in line 7, before the name "Thomas D. Harris," to insert "the legal representatives of;" in the same line, after the name, to insert "formerly;" in line 8, after "Pennsylvania," to insert "deceased;" in line 10, after the name "Harris," to strike out "the sum of \$21,627.75 for" and insert "such amount as may be found due them on account of;" in line 14, after the word "from," to strike out "them" and insert "said firm;" in line 16, after the word "thereof," to strike out "and such sum shall be in full of all claim and demand upon the part of said John H. Jones and Thomas D. Harris against the Government of the United States by reason of the premises" and insert "and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain what part of such property actually came into the possession of and was consumed or used by the United States, or under the military authorities thereof, and what part thereof was returned to the said Jones and Harris, and the value of what was so received, taken, and used, and what was returned, and what amount or balance is justly due on account thereof; and the amount, when so ascertained and paid to the legal representatives of John H. Jones and Thomas D. Harris, shall be in full satisfaction of this claim;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, au-

thorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal representatives of John H. Jones, formerly of Alliance, Ohio, deceased, and the legal representatives of Thomas D. Harris, formerly of Pittsburgh, Pa., deceased, formerly partners engaged in the manufacture of iron at Loudon, Tenn., under the firm name of Jones & Harris, such amount as may be found due them on account of rolling-mill, stock, manufactured iron, and other property captured from said firm by the Confederate forces, and afterward recaptured by the Army of the United States and converted to the use thereof; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain what part of such property actually came into the possession of and was consumed or used by the United States, or under the military authorities thereof, and what part thereof was returned to the said Jones & Harris, and the value of what was so received, taken, and used, and what was returned and what amount or balance is justly due on account thereof; and the amount, when so ascertained and paid to the legal representatives of John H. Jones and Thomas D. Harris, shall be in full satisfaction of this claim.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNITED STATES PROPERTY IN PITTSBURGH, PA.

The bill (H. R. 753) authorizing and directing the sale of certain property belonging to the United States, situate in Pittsburgh, Pa., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASHER W. FOSTER.

The bill (S. 1696) for the relief of Asher W. Foster was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to remove from the records of the War Department the charge of desertion now standing thereon against the name of Asher W. Foster, late quartermaster-sergeant of Company G of the Fourteenth Indiana Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN HINSMANN.

The bill (S. 2086) to correct the military record of John Hinsmann, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Cavalry, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to correct the military record of John Hinsmann, late private in Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Cavalry Volunteers, so as to make it read that Hinsmann died on March 5, 1864, from services performed while in the line of duty.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OCONEE RIVER BRIDGE IN GEORGIA.

The bill (H. R. 7993) to amend section 4 of "An act to authorize the county of Laurens, in the State of Georgia, to construct a bridge across the Oconee River at or near Dublin, in said county and State," approved June 18, 1888, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill (H. R. 5729) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Oconee River, in the State of Georgia, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TENNESSEE AND CUMBERLAND RIVER BRIDGE.

The bill (H. R. 380) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Cairo and Tennessee River Railroad Company to construct bridges across the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers," approved January 8, 1889, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PORTRAIT OF JOHN PAUL JONES.

The bill (S. 3397) for the purchase of George B. Matthews's portrait of John Paul Jones was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. SAWYER. I see that the Senator who reported that bill is not here, and I ask that it may go over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

MARY ALICE WHITE OGDEN.

The bill (H. R. 6034) for the relief of Mary Alice White Ogden was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Mary Alice White Ogden be, and she is hereby, relieved from any disability to make final proof, payment for, and entry of the northeast quarter of section 2, in township 2 south of range 16 east, The Dalles land district, Oregon, growing out of her marriage after her settlement upon and improvement of the same as a pre-emption claim; and that if the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior shall find the final proofs submitted by her as to said land to be otherwise satisfactory the entry shall be approved and the patent of the United States issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

REAR-ADMIRAL JAMES E. JOUETT.

The bill (S. 3418) in relation to the pay of Rear-Admiral James E. Jouett was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. INGALLS. I do not see the Senator who reported that bill in his seat.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that the Senator who reported the bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs is necessarily absent from the city in Delaware. I am entirely willing to have the Senate pass upon the bill on the report made, a unanimous report from that committee, unless there shall be objection made.

Mr. INGALLS. I have no objection to that.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to give Rear-Admiral James E. Jouett, of the United States Navy, retired, the highest pay and compensation of his grade as a rear-admiral from and after the date of the passage of the act.

Mr. INGALLS. The report had better be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. GRAY, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, April 7, 1890:

The committee to whom was referred Senate bill 1888, for the promotion of Rear-Admiral James E. Jouett, United States Navy, beg leave to report said bill adversely, and submit the accompanying substitute, which gives Admiral Jouett the full pay of his grade as rear-admiral.

The committee thought this just and right in view of the gallant and meritorious services of Admiral Jouett. He served with especial distinction during the war and was more than once conspicuous for his heroic conduct in battle. Although recommended by a board of admirals twenty-five years ago for an advancement of thirty numbers for his gallant conduct, the promotion was never made. His eminent, conspicuous, and signal acts of gallantry entitle him to some appropriate and special recognition. He has never received that reward by advancement in rank.

The committee submits herewith the following letter bearing on the subject from the Admiral of the Navy to a member of the committee:

OFFICE OF THE ADMIRAL, WASHINGTON, D. C., March 10, 1890.

DEAR SIR: Rear-Admiral James E. Jouett has made application to Congress to be placed on the same footing, on the retired-list of the Navy, with Vice-Admiral Rowan and Rear-Admiral Worden. These two officers were promoted for their services, given the thanks of Congress, which carried with it ten additional years on the active-list, and finally retired on the highest pay of their grade.

Rear-Admiral Jouett bore a conspicuous part in the war and is highly spoken of by his commanding officer, Admiral Farragut. He was also recommended by a board of admirals, of which I was a member, for an advancement of thirty numbers in his grade. Had he received this promotion it would have made him a rear-admiral some years sooner than he reached that grade. He was unjustly treated then and it ought to be made up to him now.

No officer received higher commendations from Admiral Farragut than did Rear-Admiral Jouett. The papers are on file and speak for themselves. To make a distinction between the two gallant officers who were so satisfactorily retired by Congress and Rear-Admiral Jouett would be invidious, and I therefore beg you and the other members of the Naval Committee will give Admiral Jouett's application your most generous consideration and place him on the same footing with Vice-Admiral Rowan and Rear-Admiral Worden, namely, retirement with full sea pay.

The Navy has not received a great many proofs of approval for the part it took in the late war, and acts of liberality from Congress are very gratifying. I know that I have only to draw your attention to what an officer has done to obtain a response from your generous feelings.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

DAVID D. PORTER,
Admiral, United States Navy.

HON. LELAND STANFORD,
United States Senate.

Also the following letters from officers of the Navy, representing their several corps:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF PROVISIONS AND CLOTHING,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1890.

SIR: I learn with great pleasure that a bill has been introduced in Congress for your promotion to the rank of Vice-Admiral.

This merited though tardy recognition of your distinguished services during and since the war of the rebellion will, I am sure, have the earnest support of the corps I have the honor as Paymaster-General to represent. Its members have an enduring sense, not only of the faithful and brilliant record with which you have illuminated the Navy's history, but also of the broad-gauge spirit and the frankness and fairness which have always characterized your official intercourse with your brother officers of all branches of the service. Wherever and however you have been placed the verdict of "well done" has followed your acts, and the story of Mobile Bay has conferred upon you undying though intangible honor.

The commission of Vice-Admiral would now be the fitting climax to a long and stainless career in your country's service.

Very respectfully,

JAMES FULTON,
Paymaster-General, U. S. Navy.

Rear-Admiral JAMES E. JOUETT, U. S. Navy.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 6, 1890.

MY DEAR SENATORS: I take the liberty of addressing you a few words in behalf of the proposition to make my friend, Admiral Jouett, a Vice-Admiral.

Sometime ago my attention was called to the fact that such a scheme was under consideration, and I have spoken to a number of the most prominent men of the Engineer Corps of the Navy about it. As the head of the corps, and representing it, I can most heartily say that this promotion of Admiral Jouett would be a source of much satisfaction to us.

His long and honorable career in the Navy has filled every officer with pride, and every member of the Engineer Corps has always felt that it had in him a warm friend, who was ready to do it and its members justice on every occasion.

To him, I believe, can truly be applied the famous line, "sans peur et sans reproche."

I have written you on this matter because it is frequently of importance to know the appreciation which an officer enjoys among his fellows, but Admiral Jouett's record is his best recommendation.

If you shall see fit to favor the proposed measure, you will honor a gallant officer who is and always has been an honor to his country.

Believe me, my dear Senators, with great respect,
yours very sincerely,
GEO. W. MELVILLE,
Engineer-in-Chief, U. S. Navy.

Hon. J. D. CAMERON,
Chairman Senate Naval Committee.
Hon. EUGENE HALE,
United States Senate.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1890.

DEAR SIR: I inclose herewith a copy of a bill for the promotion of Rear-Admiral James E. Jouett, United States Navy, to Vice-Admiral.

Rear-Admiral Jouett is a warm personal friend, and, having been associated with him socially as well as officially for a number of years, am deeply interested in the passage of this bill, which would confer upon him an honor well merited by his distinguished career and the important services rendered, more especially as he has not heretofore received substantial recognition of the same.

I feel that I am but voicing the sentiment of many naval officers who have been associated with Rear-Admiral Jouett, and to whom his promotion will give as great pleasure as to me.

I remain, very sincerely,

PHILIP HICHBORN,
Naval Constructor, United States Navy.

Hon. J. D. CAMERON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1890.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I learn with much pleasure that a bill is about to be introduced having for its object the promotion of Rear-Admiral James E. Jouett, United States Navy, to the rank of Vice-Admiral, and I sincerely trust that this honor may, through the wisdom of Congress, be conferred upon him in recognition of daring, gallantry, and highly distinguished career in the naval service.

I desire to add my testimony to whatever else may have been said by other naval officers in indorsement of a measure honoring one who is so universally and highly esteemed by all who have the pleasure of his acquaintance and friendship.

I remain, very sincerely,

THEODORE D. WILSON,
Chief Constructor, United States Navy, Chief of Bureau.

Hon. J. D. CAMERON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

In view of these facts the committee believes that Admiral Jouett is deservedly entitled to this tardy recognition.

The committee reports the accompanying substitute for said bill and recommends its passage.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAJ. DANIEL N. BASH.

The bill (S. 336) for the relief of Maj. Daniel N. Bash was announced as next in order.

Mr. INGALLS. As the Senator who reported that bill is not present and the amount involved is considerable, I suggest that it be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That course will be pursued unless objection be made.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope it will be passed over without prejudice, because I am very anxious to have the bill taken up and passed soon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

DANIEL B. WASHBURN.

The bill (S. 671) for the relief of Daniel B. Washburn was announced as next in order.

Mr. INGALLS. I observe that the Senator who reported that bill is not in his seat. I suggest that it be passed over.

Mr. PLATT. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], who introduced the bill, is here.

Mr. HOAR. I believe I know all about that case, and if the Senator from Kansas will allow me to explain it or have the report read, he will see, I think, that it is a very plain case.

Mr. INGALLS. I should prefer to hear the Senator who reported it.

Mr. HOAR. I introduced the bill, and there is a report. If the Senator will allow me to make a brief statement and have the bill read, then, of course, I shall not interfere with his discretion.

This man was the administrator of the pensioner. The pensioner received a check for some arrears of pension which arrived, I think, just after his death. The administrator took the check and indorsed it and paid out the entire amount of it for the debts of the pensioner, every dollar of it. Then it turned out that he had no right under the peculiar pension laws as administrator to indorse the check. He was called upon to refund the money and he did so, and the Pension Office recommend that it be paid to him by an act of Congress. That is the case.

Mr. INGALLS. The statement of the case by the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely satisfactory. I withdraw my objection and ask that the bill may be now read at length and acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. It has passed the Senate several times formerly. The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the

bill. It proposes to pay to Daniel B. Washburn \$1,193.94 for the reasons recited in the preamble.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

RETIREMENT OF NAVAL OFFICERS.

The bill (S. 969) to provide for the retirement of a certain class of officers in the United States Navy was announced as next in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that be passed over.

Mr. INGALLS. I notice that the Senator who reported that bill is not in the Chamber, and I suggest that it be passed over until he comes in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

CIVIL ENGINEERS OF THE NAVY.

The bill (S. 2540) limiting the appointment of civil engineers was announced as next in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. That bill is in the same situation as the preceding one.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

D. H. TREFETHEN.

The bill (S. 2706) for the relief of D. H. Trefethen was announced as next in order.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator who reported that bill, I believe, is not in the Chamber. I suggest that it be passed over until he returns.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

ROBERT C. MURPHY.

The bill (S. 2355) for the relief of Robert C. Murphy was announced as next in order.

Mr. INGALLS. I do not see the Senator who reported that bill in his seat.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

LOUISVILLE SINKING-FUND COMMISSIONERS.

The bill (S. 2548) for the relief of the board of the commissioners of the sinking fund of the city of Louisville, Ky., was announced as next in order.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator who reported that bill seems to be absent. I suggest that the bill be passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

SURETIES OF DENNIS MURPHY.

The bill (S. 1244) for the relief of the sureties of Dennis Murphy was announced as next in order.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator who reported that bill appears to be absent from the Chamber. I suggest that it be passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

The bill (S. 399) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will go over.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. The bill certainly will not go over because of the objection which has been made to so many other bills. The Senator who reported that bill is not absent from the Chamber, but is here, and would be very glad to have the bill considered.

Mr. PLATT. Let us take it up.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. It is an exceedingly important one.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is the objection withdrawn?

Mr. HARRIS. That is a bill which will lead to debate. We can not consider it under the five-minute rule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will go over.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I hope the Senator from Tennessee at all events will allow the bill to retain its place on the Calendar, without prejudice.

Mr. HARRIS. I did not interpose the objection, but I made the suggestion to the Senator that we could not possibly consider it under this rule. Of course I have no desire that it shall be carried over to Rule IX.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I understand the difficulty of proceeding with a bill of that character when there is so small an attendance in this body. I wish to say in regard to it that it is my purpose to ask the Senate at an early day to consider the bill, in order that we may get the judgment of this body upon the question of the propriety, to say nothing of the absolute justice, of allowing the States to determine for themselves the question that is involved in the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

HEIRS OF JOHN HOWARD PAYNE.

The bill (S. 1193) for the relief of the heir or heirs of John Howard Payne was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to appro-

appropriate \$205.92 for the payment of the amount due to the legal heir or heirs of John Howard Payne, late United States consul at Tunis.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON], who reported the bill, to state what the bill is.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read. It is very brief.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report, submitted by Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, April 9, 1890, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred Senate bill 1193, for the relief of the heir or heirs of John Howard Payne, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report:

John Howard Payne was the consul of the United States at Tunis, and died at that place, whilst filling that position, on the 9th day of April, 1832. Shortly after his death, his accounts as consul were adjusted in the Treasury Department, and a balance of \$205.92 was found to be due him, and is now standing to his credit on the books of the Register, but there is no appropriation out of which it can be paid. This amount has never been paid to any one, for the reason, as far as can be ascertained, that there was never any administration on his estate. The bill proposes to pay the same to his heir at law, who is one daughter, Mrs. Eloise E. Luquer, living in the State of New York.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOAR. I put the question to the Senator from curiosity, to know why the bill said the payment should be to the heir, and not to the legal representative, but it is answered sufficiently in the report.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland. Yes, sir.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT BLAISDELL.

The bill (S. 2700) for the relief of Albert Blaisdell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Albert Blaisdell, a citizen of Virginia, \$1,000, being the amount of a certified check deposited by him as bidder for a contract to erect a stone wharf at the custom-house at Charleston, on the 17th of January, 1885, the check having been collected by the Treasury Department and the proceeds covered into the Treasury of the United States.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAR CLAIMS OF CALIFORNIA, ETC.

The bill (S. 2416) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator who reported that bill does not appear to be in the Chamber, and the sum involved is between two and three million dollars. I suggest that the bill be passed over.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator from California [Mr. HEARST] just left the Chamber, and he desired me in case any matter came up touching the interests of his State, to see that it was passed. He desires that this bill shall be passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the bill be passed over.

Mr. BLAIR. If there is to be discussion it may as well go over, I suppose, without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will go over without prejudice.

COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

The bill (S. 3473) making appropriations for the improvement of the Columbia River was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator from Oregon how much is involved in this bill?

Mr. DOLPH. About \$3,500,000 for the two works, at the mouth of the Columbia and at the Cascades. It requires about \$2,300,000 to complete the work at the mouth of the Columbia and about \$1,250,000 for the Cascades.

Mr. HOAR. Running through how many years?

Mr. DOLPH. It runs through three or four years.

Mr. ALLISON. It is usual to make these appropriations on the river and harbor bill. I do not know that there is anything specially to take this out of the usual course.

Mr. DOLPH. This is simply following the line of the two bills that have already passed the Senate, one for Galveston Harbor and one for Sault Ste. Marie. It is in the line of economy to appropriate the whole amount now.

Mr. CULLOM. This bill came from the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DAWES. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon if this is for the purpose of completing the canal at the Cascades.

Mr. DOLPH. It is for the purpose of completing the canal and the work at the mouth of the Columbia both.

Mr. DAWES. How much is it supposed it will take to complete that canal?

Mr. DOLPH. The amount required by the estimates is \$1,250,000. The amount appropriated by the bill, running through a series of three years, would be the same, \$1,250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary. It is estimated that from 25 to 33 per cent. would be saved by a lump appropriation.

Mr. DAWES. Is it not understood that a great mistake has been made in laying out a canal and lock there a great deal larger than the requirement of any possible commerce?

Mr. DOLPH. I do not know that it is so understood among the en-

gineers. There are some people who think the lock is larger than it ought to be. But it is partly constructed. There has been more money expended on it already than it will take to complete it. Of course there can be no change of plan, and the work will have to be completed.

Mr. DAWES. There is no doubt that they have got in so far that it is just as cheap to go out one way as it is the other, but the question is whether they have a lock there a great deal larger than any possible need of commerce.

Mr. DOLPH. I think not and the engineers think not. There are some people who claim that it is larger than it should be. The only question is a question of economy as to whether the work shall proceed in a business-like manner.

Mr. DAWES. The chairman of the Committee on Commerce was there not a great while ago, and the impression made upon him, as I understood him, was that it was a great and strange outlay upon a scale altogether beyond the possibilities of use for commerce.

Mr. PLATT. But he assents to this report, does he not?

Mr. DAWES. I do not know as to that. I make the inquiry because—

Mr. DOLPH. The chairman has already prepared a report which recommends the work and that an appropriation be made for it in the annual appropriations in the river and harbor bill. There is no question about the utility of the work or its economy.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BATE. Is there a report?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is no report.

Mr. INGALLS. It seems to me that it is hardly appropriate for a bill of this magnitude to pass under the circumstances that surround us here, without the report of the engineers or any further information than we have. The amount involved is enormous, and while I have not any doubt of the statement of the Senator from Oregon, it certainly appears to me to be improvident to act upon a measure of this kind as we are now situated. I hope the Senator will allow the bill to be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. DOLPH. Well, if the Senator objects to its consideration I can not help myself.

Mr. INGALLS. No, I do not object. I hope the Senator from Oregon will consent to let the bill pass over without prejudice.

Mr. PLATT. It can probably be taken up on Saturday.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the next case on the Calendar be announced.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. INGALLS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. SAWYER. Oh, no.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. SAWYER. If the Senator from Kansas will withdraw the motion to adjourn I will ask to go to the Calendar to dispose of about forty pension cases that have been reported since last Saturday.

Mr. COCKRELL. We can take them up some other time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 15, 1890, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate the 14th day of May, 1890.

UNITED STATES CONSUL.

Samuel L. Gracey, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Cardiff, *vice* Evan R. Jones, recalled.

PROMOTIONS IN REVENUE SERVICE.

Third Lieut. Daniel J. Ainsworth, of Virginia, to be a second lieutenant in the revenue service of the United States, to succeed Second Lieut. Charles T. Brian, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles T. Brian, of Virginia, to be a first lieutenant in the revenue service of the United States, to succeed First Lieut. Thomas S. Smyth, promoted.

Third Lieut. J. Charles Harris, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the revenue service of the United States, to succeed Second Lieut. John U. Rhodes, promoted.

Third Lieut. David H. Jarvis, of Maryland, to be a second lieutenant in the revenue service of the United States, to succeed Second Lieut. John E. Lutz, resigned.

Third Lieut. Kirtland W. Perry, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the revenue service of the United States, to succeed Second Lieut. George Delap, deceased.

Third Lieut. Johnstone H. Quinan, of Maryland, to be a second lieutenant in the revenue service of the United States, to succeed Second Lieut. George H. Doty, resigned.

Third Lieut. Byron L. Reed, of the District of Columbia, to be a second lieutenant in the revenue service of the United States, to succeed Second Lieut. Edmund Burke, resigned.

Third Lieut. James L. Sill, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the revenue service of the United States, to succeed Second Lieut. George A. York, resigned.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

William Gaw, jr., of Pennsylvania, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, in the place of George H. Hoffman, removed. Mr. Gaw was temporarily commissioned, during the recess of the Senate, April 12, 1889.

PENSION AGENTS.

William H. Osborne, of East Bridgewater, Mass., to be pension agent at Boston, Mass., *vice* Benjamin F. Peach, jr., term expired.

John C. Currier, of San Miguel, Cal., to be pension agent at San Francisco, Cal., *vice* Truman H. Allen, whose term of office will expire June 6, 1890.

INDIAN AGENTS.

Peter Ronan, of St. Ignatius, Mont., to be agent for the Indians of the Flathead agency, in Montana, to take effect May 5, 1890, at the expiration of his present term of office. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

David E. Bomgardner, of Orleans, Nebr., to be receiver of public moneys at McCook, Nebr., *vice* Jacob Steinmetz, to be removed.

Anson S. Baldwin, of Lexington, Nebr., to be receiver of public moneys at North Platte, Nebr., *vice* John Treacy, to be removed.

Alfred T. Campbell, of Miles City, Mont., to be receiver of public moneys at Miles City, Mont., *vice* Abram Hall, whose term of office will expire June 15, 1890.

Lon E. Foote, of Colorado, to be receiver of public moneys at Hugo, Colo., a newly established office.

Robert C. Heydlauff, of Ashland, Wis., to be receiver of public moneys at Ashland, Wis., *vice* Lloyd T. Boyd, term expired.

Thomas S. Lang, of The Dalles, Oregon, to be receiver of public moneys at The Dalles, Oregon, *vice* Thomas W. Slusher, deceased.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

John H. McKee, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Hugo, Colo., a newly established office.

John I. Nesbitt, of North Platte, Nebr., to be register of the land office at North Platte, Nebr., *vice* William Neville, to be removed.

John F. Sheehan, of San Francisco, Cal., to be register of the land office at San Francisco, Cal., *vice* Abraham C. Bradford, deceased.

Joseph Tracy, of Hydesville, Cal., to be register of the land office at Humboldt, Cal., *vice* Stanley C. Boom, to be removed.

CHIEF BUREAU OF PROVISIONS AND CLOTHING.

Pay Inspector Edwin Stewart, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Provisions and Clothing and Paymaster-General in the Department of the Navy, with the relative rank of commodore, to fill a vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, May 14, 1890.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William H. H. Clayton, of Arkansas, to be attorney of the United States for the western district of Arkansas.

INDIAN AGENT.

Wallace R. Lesser, of Tama, Iowa, to be agent for the Indians of the Sac and Fox agency, in Iowa.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Isaac Moffett, of New Jersey, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Albert H. Jones, of Colorado, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Colorado.

UNITED STATES CONSUL.

John S. Durham, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at San Domingo.

TERRITORIAL CHIEF-JUSTICE.

Edward B. Green, of Illinois, to be chief-justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATE JUSTICES.

John G. Clark, of Wisconsin, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

Abraham J. Seay, of Missouri, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

OKLAHOMA TERRITORIAL OFFICES.

George W. Steele, of Marion, Ind., to be governor of the Territory of Oklahoma.

Robert Martin, of Elreno, Oklahoma, to be secretary of the Territory of Oklahoma.

Horace Speed, of Oklahoma, to be attorney of the United States for the Territory of Oklahoma.

Warren S. Lurty, of Virginia, to be marshal of the United States for the Territory of Oklahoma.

POSTMASTERS.

David F. Ritchie, to be postmaster at Saratoga Springs, in the county of Saratoga and State of New York.

James Sullivan, to be postmaster at Harrisonburgh, in the county of Rockingham and State of Virginia.

George W. Kenney, to be postmaster at Danvers, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts.

John Kirkpatrick, to be postmaster at South Hadley Falls, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts.

Dexter S. Eaton, to be postmaster at Moravia, in the county of Cayuga and State of New York.

William H. Strothers, to be postmaster at Warrenton, in the county of Fauquier and State of Virginia.

Thomas J. Watt, to be postmaster at Columbus, in the county of Muscogee and State of Georgia.

Miss Stella R. Laird, to be postmaster at La Grange, in the county of Troup and State of Georgia.

Warham Parks, to be postmaster at Oconomowoc, in the county of Waukesha and State of Wisconsin.

Mrs. Clara D'Arcy, to be postmaster at Puyallup, in the county of Pierce and State of Washington.

William W. P. McConnell, to be postmaster at Mankato, in the county of Blue Earth and State of Minnesota.

James N. Rogers, to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Huntington and State of Indiana.

Charles H. Weatherwax, to be postmaster at Placerville, in the county of El Dorado and State of California.

Isaac S. Miller, to be postmaster at Ontario, in the county of San Bernardino and State of California.

Samuel W. Backus, to be postmaster at San Francisco, in the county of San Francisco and State of California.

Wilson McCandless, to be postmaster at Hutchinson, in the county of Reno and State of Kansas.

W. Lee Person, to be postmaster at Rocky Mount, in the county of Edgecombe and State of North Carolina.

Harrison Reed, to be postmaster at Tallahassee, in the county of Leon and State of Florida.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, May 14, 1890.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to state that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON] is sick in bed. I ask leave of absence for him. There being no objection, leave was granted.

PENSIONS.

The bill (S. 389) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents was laid before the House, with the notification that the Senate disagreed to the amendment of the House and asked a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that the House insist on its amendment and agree to a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

HELEN PLUNKETT.

Mr. MORRILL. I wish to submit the conference report which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1221) granting a pension to Helen Plunkett, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "twenty-five" and insert the word "thirty;" and the House agree to the same.

E. N. MORRILL,
J. P. FLICK,
C. H. TURNER,
Managers on part of the House.
PHILETUS SAWYER,
C. K. DAVIS,
CHAS. J. FAULKNER,
Managers on part of the Senate.

Mr. MORRILL. I move the adoption of this report. The report was adopted.

PURE LARD.

Mr. BIGGS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition from citizens of Merced County, in the Second Congressional district of California, in favor of the bill to prevent adulteration in lard.

There was no objection. The petition is as follows:

Petition in favor of pure lard.

To the American Congress:

The undersigned, citizens of Merced County, Second Congressional district, in the State of California, would respectfully urge the earliest possible adoption of the bill to prevent lard adulteration, reported favorably from the Committee on Agriculture of the Fifty-first Congress, and known as "the Conger bill."

SALARY OF LATE CHIEF-JUSTICE WAITE.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief letter, embracing only a few lines, from distinguished gentlemen in Ohio in regard to the unpaid salary of the late Chief-Justice Waite.

There was no objection. The document is as follows:

TOLEDO, OHIO, May 6, 1890.

DEAR SIR: A bill has passed the Senate giving to the estate of the late Chief-Justice Waite the salary which would have been due him at the end of the year if his life had been prolonged to that time.

In view of the fact that he could have retired on his pay a year or more before his death, and of his services, the undersigned respectfully urge you to support the bill in the House and use your influence to procure its passage.

With great respect, we have the honor to be, sincerely, yours, truly,

Geo. R. Haynes, C. H. Scribner, C. S. Bentley, P. H. Dowling, Wm. T. Carrington, C. F. Curtis, S. C. Reynolds, F. B. Thornaker, Abner L. Backus, C. A. Strong, Denison B. Smith, Sam'l M. Young, H. S. Walbridge, J. K. Secor, H. S. Young, F. J. King, C. F. Adams, C. M. Baker, R. Cowing, J. K. Hamilton, W. A. Gosline.

CHARLES H. GROSVENOR, M. C., Washington, D. C.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate requested the House to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 2770) granting a pension to Edwin S. Furman.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill (S. 2601) to change the route of the Rock Creek Railway Company, and for other purposes, in which concurrence was requested.

TARIFF BILL.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to resume the consideration of the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. GROSVENOR in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and equalize the duty on imports, and for other purposes.

The pending paragraph was the following:

Lime, 6 cents per 100 pounds, including weight of barrel or package.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to move an amendment to the pending clause.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Before that is done I ask unanimous consent to make a verbal amendment in line 22, paragraph 36.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the period and dash after the word "magnesia," in line 22, and substitute a comma, and change the capital "C" in the word "carbonate" to a small "c."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to amend the pending clause by striking out the last word. I make this motion simply for the purpose of submitting a statement.

Yesterday the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY]—I regret that I do not now see him in his seat, but I will make my statement nevertheless—characterized as incorrect a statement which I made to the effect that cement was manufactured in the State of Maine. I have obtained a copy of the report on manufactures embraced in the Tenth Census, the census of 1880. On page 976 of the Compendium I find a list of selected industries in Maine; and under the head of "Mechanical and manufacturing industries," lime and cement are put under the same head, with twenty-eight establishments, \$947,000 of capital invested, employing 301 operatives, paying \$86,000 in wages and having an output in the whole State for both industries of \$599,000, nearly \$600,000. So that the committee need not be surprised that one who lives 2,000 miles from Maine should have been misled as to the question whether cement is in fact an industry of that State. The Tenth Census, which is supposed to have properly set forth our industries puts down the lime and cement industry as one of the industries of Maine.

I desire to call attention to the fact, and I am glad to see the gentleman from Maine now in his seat, that at the time when the census of 1880 was taken there were employed in both industries (lime and cement) in the whole State of Maine only 301 persons, and the output of both industries was less than \$600,000. In the gentleman's interesting speech on yesterday he stated that in Knox County, one of the counties of Maine, where lime is largely produced—a county in his district—there were made last year 2,000,000 barrels of lime, giving employment directly and indirectly to thousands of men, and contributing

immensely to the prosperity of the country, and mainly to the prosperity of more than 50,000 people. He also said:

In the country at large this industry is of great importance.

The gentleman made this statement on yesterday, and I presume it is correct.

Mr. ROGERS. And as I understand it all of this growth of the industry has taken place under the present tariff?

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly. I was just going to remark that notwithstanding that only 301 persons were employed in this industry in Maine, in the whole State in 1880, yet now the gentleman boasts that there are over 50,000 people in one county and that the industry has flourished under a protective tariff of 10 per cent. But, notwithstanding this exceptional prosperity in this industry and the remarkable growth in a few years, the gentleman from Maine now comes in and says "we will be utterly destroyed and ruined" unless the duty is increased from 10 per cent. up to 35 per cent. ad valorem, or over 250 per cent. increase.

I also stated that the industry was in a combination, which was denied by the gentleman from Maine and also by his other colleague [Mr. MILLIKEN]. I have before me, Mr. Chairman, a special dispatch published in Rockland, the county seat of Knox County, Maine, written by one who is demanding greater protection to lime, in which I find the following:

A nominal combination has existed for several years in the lime business—

This also in the face of the statement that there is no "combination" in connection with the matter—

A committee of nine issues a circular from time to time advising as to production. Lime airslacks and is a perishable commodity and an overproduction is a very bad thing, as the experience of 1887 proves. There is no pool, no forfeiture, no penalties, and no dividends—

Except, I suppose, to the producers of the lime. No dividend to the working people—

The manufacturers have capacity for double the consumption of the whole country, and some arrangement as to production is necessary.

Mr. ROGERS. I understood on yesterday that the arrangement to which reference was made was gotten up to prevent the spoiling of lime on the market, and also to prevent the market from being destroyed by Canada.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; both. So it is admitted by the friends of this industry that a combine which is understood to control the production exists; and our friend on the other side states that it has grown enormously for the past ten years under the present duties. Then, I ask, what is the necessity for increasing the duty?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, inasmuch as we have passed beyond that provision, to return to this article of lime, and I shall move to strike out the rate proposed in the bill and reduce it to the old rate.

Mr. McMILLIN. We have already passed that paragraph and I object to return. [Cries of "Regular order."]

Mr. DINGLEY. It is unnecessary, Mr. Chairman, to make any reply to the gentleman from Illinois; what I stated on yesterday covers the whole ground.

Mr. SPRINGER. I neglected to state one thing, that according to the census of 1880 the wages paid in Maine for that industry amounted to the enormous sum of about \$23 per month, or about 90 cents a day for each working day, which was much less than that stated by the gentleman as the amount paid in Canada for this service.

Mr. ROGERS. He stated it was \$1.75, I believe?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; but according to the report of the census of 1880 the average wages in this industry amounted to only \$23.88 a month.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Earthenware and china.
103. Common brown earthenware, common stoneware and crucibles, not ornamented or decorated in any manner, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. BYNUM. I move the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "twenty-five" and insert "fifteen."

Mr. BYNUM. I think the duty ought to be made to correspond with the reduction on this grade of the earthenware schedule.

Mr. DOCKERY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this industry is in a trust now?

Mr. BYNUM. It is in the pottery trust.

Mr. DOCKERY. And this bill will increase the duty?

Mr. BYNUM. This bill, in connection with the administrative bill, will largely increase the duty.

[Mr. BYNUM further addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. COGSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I notice in the speech of my colleague [Mr. ANDREW] on this bill there is appended a list of petitions (proprietors and managers of iron-working establishments in New England) in favor of putting iron ore, coal, and coke on the free-list. In this list, on page 4614 of the RECORD, I find the name of the Cape Ann Anchor Works, of Gloucester, Mass. I have here a letter from the

officers of that company denying that they are such petitioners, and I desire to have read and made a part of the record the following letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

GLOUCESTER, MASS., May 12, 1890.

DEAR GENERAL: We would call your attention to inclosed slip taken from the Boston Sunday Herald of May 11.

We would say, in regard to the petition referred to, that the board of directors knew nothing of it, and it was not signed with the knowledge or consent of either the president or treasurer of the Cape Ann Anchor Works.

Yours, respectfully,

N. H. PHILLIPS, President.
GEORGE R. BRADFORD, Treasurer.

Hon. WILLIAM COGSWELL.

Mr. COGSWELL. No doubt this was done inadvertently by my colleague.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts. In my remarks on Saturday last I merely read from a petition as it was printed and sent to me. In that petition it states, among a list of some six hundred names, this company signed by the agent. Of course what authority the agent had I know nothing about.

Mr. MORSE. I move to strike out the last word.

I desire in the same line to correct my colleague from Massachusetts with reference to another manufacturer, the great Fairbanks scale works, at St. Johnsbury, Vt., and quoted by him as opposing the duty upon iron and coal. I desire to send to the Clerk's desk and have read a letter from the Fairbanks scale manufacturers upon that subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Boston Journal.]

The statement has been extensively circulated that Messrs. E. & T. Fairbanks & Co., of St. Johnsbury, Vt., were among the manufacturers who had signed a petition for a reduction of the duties on pig-iron, scrap-iron, and scrap-steel, and for free importation of iron ore, coal, and coke. The statement is emphatically contradicted by Mr. Franklin Fairbanks, president of the company. Mr. Fairbanks says:

"We never joined in any petition for reduction of tariff duties or for free iron and coal, and it would be a sorry day for St. Johnsbury when said duties are removed. A very large share of our sales of scales are made to iron manufacturers, and anything tending to break down the blast-furnaces or rolling-mills of Pennsylvania or of any other State would greatly reduce our manufacturing and necessitate a large reduction in our help. We are to-day buying coal from Pennsylvania and Maryland at a less price than we paid for English and Pictou coal under a free tariff."

Moreover, Mr. Fairbanks, commenting on the assertion that nearly all the iron and steel manufacturers of New England joined in the petition for free iron and coal, observes that this was not the case, but "the petitioners were mainly importers of foreign iron and steel." The position of the Fairbanks firm upon this question has been so misrepresented in current newspaper articles and in debate that Mr. Fairbanks's explicit declaration that "we are not in favor of free iron and coal" deserves particular attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will consider the *pro forma* amendment to be withdrawn.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. The gentleman from Indiana stated in reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] that there is a pottery trust in this country. I deny this emphatically, in toto, in general, and in particular, and I know what I am talking about. The gentleman said that the effect of this item under consideration, taken in connection with what is known as the McKinley administrative bill, would be to increase the price of common earthenware, as he first said, 10 per cent.; finally he got up to, I think, 35 or 40 per cent.

I desire to say to this Committee of the Whole that there are not facts sufficient to sustain the statement. The administrative bill does place a duty upon the coverings. At present they are not dutiable. The inland transportation and freight is not made a part of the McKinley bill. Inland transportation is not added, and the only addition that is left them is the coverings.

I have been in the warehouses, and I have seen hundreds, yes, I may say thousands, of crates of ware opened. I speak of my own knowledge when I say that these importations are very largely in open-work crates, made of withes and twisted boughs and small limbs of trees. These crates sell for from \$1.50 to \$3.50 each. They contain from \$50 to \$500 worth of earthenware, according to the quality, and this item, giving a rate per cent. ad valorem, will give to the Government this per cent. on an average of \$2 for each crate. This item is practically unimportant. These crates when imported are resold. They are used again and there is no reason why they should not have a duty imposed upon them precisely the same as any other article of merchandise imported into this country. The statement can be substantiated without any difficulty whatever that this bill practically leaves the rate, so far as the item under consideration is concerned, precisely where the law now places it. The duty on the covering is to be added by the other bill, which has not become a law, but which I admit undoubtedly will become a law. I will say that there is no line of importation, it seems to me, in which the duty on coverings will be so small as they will in the line of crockery, because of the rough, crude, and inexpensive character of these crates.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there is in all of this indefensible bill scarcely any section more unjust than the one now under consideration. The existing rates were put upon pottery in the Forty-seventh Congress. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] then defended them on the ground that it was

necessary to increase them, because the abolition of the duty upon crates and coverings amounted to a reduction of 10 per cent. Mr. Chairman, permit me to correct myself there. That statement was made by Senator MORRILL, at the other end of the Capitol. When the gentleman from Ohio came to defend the schedule he quoted with approval a statement of Mr. Morrison, of Illinois, that it might amount to 17½ per cent.

Now, sir, in the course of the debate upon this very question, in the last Congress, I sent to the Clerk's desk and had read a letter which will be found on page 6490 of the RECORD, first session of the Fiftieth Congress, from an importer, giving exact figures, and I will append it to my remarks to-day, by which it will be shown that the increase in the duty upon plain white earthenware, by the provisions of the administrative bill, will amount to 13.50 per cent. and upon decorated ware it would be 8½ per cent.

Here, then, we have an actual increase in the duty of 13½ per cent. upon the commoner grades of earthenware and of 8 or 10 per cent. upon the better grades, by these provisions in the administrative bill which call for the appraisement of "cartons, cases, boxes, sacks, and coverings of any kind, and all other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing the merchandise in a condition packed ready for shipment to the United States." Now, there is no justification for the maintenance of the present rates of duty, much less for their increase. When the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] defended this same schedule in the Forty-seventh Congress, he said that the foreigner supplied 60 per cent. of our home market and the home producer but 40 per cent.

According to the figures which he gave us in his opening speech the other day, under the operation of the existing law in seven years the condition has been exactly reversed, and the home producer has gathered 20 per cent. more, so that he had now 60 per cent. of the home market while the foreigner had lost 20 per cent. and had remaining but 40 per cent. of that market. Now, ought not that to be sufficient to satisfy the demand of any producer in this country? If he has been able to go forward 20 per cent. and advance his control of the home market to 60 per cent. in the past seven years under the operation of the present law, what possible reason or excuse can there be for adding from 10 to 15 per cent. protection in this case, and more or less in others, against the importation of foreign wares. It may be true, and doubtless it is true, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] tells us, that there is not to-day a trust in the pottery business in the United States; but all of us who read the papers know that a few months ago they contained many notices of an attempt to form a pottery trust. There was news at times that a pottery trust had been formed, but finally that the negotiation had fallen through because some company or other had declined to go into the trust. But, Mr. Chairman, if we raise the duties as contemplated by this bill we will make it possible for them to form a trust. The home producers have already 60 per cent. of the home market, and if you raise these duties 10 or 15 per cent. you will find that the American manufacturers will form a trust and will control the entire home market.

NEW YORK, June, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to ask your attention to the following actual transaction, as exemplifying the increased duty which would be levied upon plain white and decorated earthenware, if such were assessed in the cost of crates in addition to that now paid upon the goods only:

I imported 484 crates of earthenware April 3, 1888, ex steamer Duke of Buckingham, at Newport News, Va., paying duty thereon as follows:

261 crates, plain white, value \$7,583.51, at 55 per cent.....	\$4,182.43
223 crates decorated, value \$10,970.71, at 60 per cent.....	6,582.43

Total duty paid..... 10,714.86

With the cost of crates added I would be assessed on 261 crates plain white, value \$8,542.35, at 55 per cent., \$4,698.28, or 68.7 per cent., additional 13.7 per cent.; 223 crates decorated, value \$11,867.46, at 60 per cent., \$7,120.47, or 68½ per cent., additional 8½ per cent. All these figures can be verified by reference to my entry on file at Newport News.

Were your bill passed as originally introduced, the reduction from present rates would only be on plain white, 6.3 per cent.; on decorated, 6½ per cent.

The importation specified is a fair and impartial example, and the result is correct and unprejudiced.

Respectfully,

THOMAS H. TAYLOR.

Hon. R. Q. MILLS,

Chairman Ways and Means Committee, Washington.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, a single word further as to the trust business to which the gentleman from West Virginia, has referred. Some time ago word was sent from abroad asking if it was not possible to secure the control of some manufacturing enterprises in my State. An attempt was made to open negotiations with our pottery people, but the offers were not entertained, and that was the whole of the business. Sir, are our people to be punished because they refused to enter this trust?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "fifteen."

Mr. BURROWS. I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] makes a motion to reduce the rate upon this class of pottery, asserting that it is a tax upon the people and that by reducing the rate this product will be furnished cheaper to the consumer. I hold in my hand a copy of an invoice of these goods sold in 1860 to a Chicago firm for \$312.15. The exact duplicate of that

crate of crockery was sold in 1890, this year, for \$239.15, showing that under the protective tariff the price of this class of crockery to the consumer has been constantly diminished.

I have also a statement from Mr. E. M. Pearson, president of the Wheeling Pottery Company, of Wheeling, W. Va. (whom I presume the gentleman from West Virginia knows), in which he says that in 1852 an assorted crate of this ware was sold for \$95.30, and that an exact duplicate of that crate of crockery was sold in 1890, this year, for \$46.30. These figures, I think, answer completely the statement of the gentleman from Indiana that he makes his motion in the interest of the consumer.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. In the annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics on the foreign commerce of the United States for the year ending June 30, 1880, it is stated that in 1860 a bushel of corn sold for 72 cents. Now, as I understand, it can be bought in some parts of the country for 10 cents. Does the gentleman from Michigan contend that this tariff, which he says has brought down the price of crockery, has also brought down the price of corn? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BURROWS. I do not see how that has the slightest applicability to this question.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I do not, either. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURROWS. Corn and wheat and other products have gone up and down in the last twenty years; but the prices of our pottery products since the industry was established after the close of the war have rapidly and steadily diminished.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I do not see the force of the gentleman's argument. I admit that my argument is not a good one, but it is the same kind of argument that is used to sustain the protective tariff.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to give an argument that is a good one. I desire to repeat an argument made by a distinguished ex-President of the United States. John Quincy Adams, in his report upon the tariff of 1832, says:

The doctrine that duties of impost cheapen the price of the articles upon which they are levied seems to conflict with the first dictates of common sense.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

But its supporters first appeal with confidence to the fact that most of the articles upon which additional duties were levied by the tariff of 1828 have, since that time, considerably fallen in price, and then they argue that it must be so by the excitement of competition in the market. It is certainly contrary to the natural course of things that an addition to the cost should be a reduction of the price of the article.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if it were a fact that the tariff reduced the price of the article to the manufacturer every manufacturer would be fighting the tariff.

The argument which the friends and supporters of protection constantly make is that the American manufacturers can not stand in the market with such prices as must prevail if foreign competition be admitted, and that they must be protected against the cheaper prices of goods coming from foreign countries. Then we say, "Very well; we will meet you on that argument; if it be true, you propose to add by law an additional burden to the tax-payer." "Oh, no," they reply; "when you put on the duty the article is cheapened." That answers their own argument.

Now, the whole argument of protection from the beginning has been that it is necessary to hold the home markets against the foreigner; and that the only way you can do this is to place by law an additional burden on the foreign products brought into the country. You raise the market price in order to enable the domestic producer to sell his goods at the market price as made by law, and to charge the additional burden upon the consumer. Why, Mr. Chairman, if it were courteous to say so, I would say it is nonsense for our friends to contend that putting an additional tax upon the consumer cheapens the product to him. As Mr. Adams said, it conflicts with the plainest dictates of common sense. The burden to the consumer is increased, and it is for that very reason that the manufacturer comes and asks that the duty be imposed. If there were anything that we could do by law to cheapen the price of the manufactured product, the whole manufacturing fraternity of this country would be in arms on this floor to defeat such a proposition. The effect of what they ask is to increase the price.

It is true, as gentlemen on the other side contend, that the cost of production as to numbers of articles has come down since 1860. But the tariff has not brought down those prices. The cost to the consumer has come down because the producer has been enabled to produce the article at a lower cost; and this has been caused by the genius of the people, mostly the American people, some in other countries, who have invented or discovered methods by which a larger quantity of given things can be produced in a given time. The illustration presented yesterday by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] may be repeated. By the use of the old spinning-wheel one person in a given time could produce one thread; now, by reason of the introduction of the spinning-mule one person can spin 1,100 threads in the same time, and can spin five times the length of thread that could be spun before. Yet fifty years ago the wages of a person spinning a single thread were about one-fourth of the wages of the person who to-day spins 1,100 threads in the same time.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in making a statement which is not true a man may be truthful so far as he himself is concerned or he may not be. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] that there is not one word of truth in what he says about the manufacturers coming before the committee here and asking that the tariff be put up or put down for their protection. There is not a word of truth in it. I do not mean by this that gentlemen who make the statement say that which they know to be untrue. They may believe it. I do not see how it is possible for them to believe it; but that is their business, not mine.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the tariff is of no earthly consequence to the manufacturers as such. No manufacturer has come before the Ways and Means Committee and asked that duties be put up or put down on his account. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] You can not find an instance of that kind—not one. You can find cases where manufacturers coming before the Ways and Means Committee have said that paying the wages they do the tariff must be this or that. And as a manufacturer I want to say that the workmen get every dollar of the price that is added to anything because of the tariff. And more than that: Gladstone says that wages are pressing hard upon the manufacturers of this country, harder than they are in England, and that the profits are not as much to the manufacturers in this country as to manufacturers in England. Every man who knows anything about the matter knows this statement of Mr. Gladstone is true.

In behalf of the manufacturers, I wish to say it would be just as unfair for me to declare that the purpose, and the only purpose, of these gentlemen on the other side who come from non-manufacturing districts is to reduce the wages of all the workmen at the North so that they and their constituents may buy their goods just as cheaply as they can be sold in England and throw American mechanics out of work. I might as well say that the purpose of those gentlemen is malicious and baneful toward the interests of this country, and intended to be so, as for them to say that the manufacturers are "robber barons;" that they "stand like vultures at the door of every workingman" to steal the bread and meat from the mouths of his wife and children. That is precisely what gentlemen on the other side are saying to us. As a manufacturer I hurl back to them, as an insult to me and every other manufacturer in this country, their whole talk on this tariff question. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have risen for the purpose of saying something in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]; but before doing so I wish to recall, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], a bit of history. In the tariff act of 1883 the duty was raised on certain qualities of manufactured woolen goods. In a subsequent Congress, when that tariff had been in operation for about eighteen months, witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee were asked whether in any single instance the wages of any operative engaged in the manufacture of that kind of goods on which the duty had been raised by the act of 1883 had been raised; and those witnesses were unable to state that a single man had had his wages increased, although the duty was raised. Yet the gentleman from Massachusetts would have us believe that all these applications of manufacturers for increase of tariff duties are made disinterestedly for the benefit of the workmen.

The gentleman from Michigan has produced here an invoice of 1852 and one of 1860 and has compared them with invoices of to-day. He argues that because these goods are lower to-day than they were in 1852 and 1860, because the tariff is higher—and has been for thirty years—than it was then, the high tariff has cheapened the price of these goods. Now, his argument answers itself. If the tariff was lower in 1852 and 1860 than to-day and if the higher tariff to-day is insufficient to protect the home manufacturer against the foreigner, does it not legitimately follow that goods have cheapened more rapidly abroad than here? There is no sort of doubt about it. The argument can not be answered. The invoices of 1852 and 1860 cover the prices of commodities imported with the duty added; and now, when the foreigner, adding a higher duty to his goods, is still able to compete with the American manufacturer, who enjoys a tariff twice as large as it was thirty years ago, what gentleman on this floor will undertake to deny the conclusion which irresistibly follows that the prices abroad have gone down more rapidly on this quality of crockery-ware than here? Is there any answer to the argument? Did competition here affect it?

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. HERBERT. Why, certainly not. It was the competition abroad. England sells for the same prices in South America as in North America, and all over the world she sells cheaper goods than our people are allowed to buy. Improved processes are everywhere cheapening manufactures—cheapening them here and cheapening them abroad. These goods were lower abroad thirty years ago than here by 20 per cent. They are lower abroad now than here, lower now by at least 50 per cent. We have been paying for twenty-five years at least 50 per cent. more for these goods than the foreigner. This bill intends that hereafter we shall pay for these goods at least 60 per cent. more than the foreigner.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, not being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I have felt considerable hesitation about entering into this debate at all, and I must confess that I am not familiar enough with these schedules to discuss the items therein or the effect of the duty proposed upon the same with as much certainty as other gentlemen who have made a careful study of this matter on the committee. But perhaps a general remark or two in reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] may not be amiss.

The gentleman insists that the tariff does not reduce the price of the article upon which it is levied. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have asserted the truthfulness of that proposition. It seems that the gentleman from Texas questions it, however. Now, I have just before me, it so happens, the statistical abstract, No. 12, for 1889, and I find therein some forcible statistical examples to which I wish to call the attention of gentlemen as to the effect of duty on prices according to the position taken by gentlemen on the other side of the House. I find, for instance, that in 1875 corn was selling in this country at 84 cents a bushel. There is a duty of 10 cents a bushel on corn. It sold last year, 1889, at an average of 47 cents per bushel.

Does the gentleman from Texas mean to say that it is not owing to the duty of 10 cents a bushel that the price of corn has gone down since 1875 from 84 cents to 47 cents a bushel? [Laughter.] There is a duty of 20 cents on wheat. In 1875 wheat was selling at \$1.12 a bushel in the markets of this country, and last year the average price was 87 cents. Does the gentleman mean to deny that that reduction is the effect of the protective tariff system of the country? [Laughter.] I find further that there was a tariff of from 15 to 30 cents on leather; and in 1875 it was selling at 26 cents a pound. Last year this price had fallen to 16 cents a pound. The gentleman certainly will not deny that the reduction is on account of the protective-tariff system of the country. [Laughter.]

On lard, too, there is a duty. This article was selling in 1875 at 13 cents a pound. The rate of tariff duty is 2 cents a pound, and it has gone down in value on account of the 2 cents tariff from 13 cents to 8 cents a pound. Butter, upon which was only a duty of 4 cents a pound, has gone down from 25 cents to 16 cents; and in order to affect it still further, and decrease the price of butter I presume, the gentleman having this bill in charge proposes to increase the duty 2 cents a pound, and then I imagine we may be enabled to buy our butter at 10 cents a pound. [Laughter.]

Now, as to the proposition of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], that the effect of the protective duty on manufactured articles has been to reduce the price, I have heard that asseverated and with great emphasis by gentlemen on this floor. Of course, the object of putting a duty on any article is to reduce prices, and the purpose was, I presume, to enable the manufacturers to pay their labor higher wages. That is the purpose, as we are informed by the protectionists, and hence it was desired to reduce the selling price of the article. [Laughter.] I know of but one instance of logic equal to this, which was in the story of a clothes vender, who asserted to his customer that he sold his clothes always at 20 per cent. below cost. "Well," said the customer, "how is it that you can sell your goods at 20 per cent. below cost and manage to get along and make a living?"

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Oh, that is an old chestnut.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The old-clothes man replied to my friend: "It is because I sell so many that I can sell so low." [Laughter.] Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts says "that is an old chestnut." Well, say that it is an old chestnut. It is a good illustration of the point; but to satisfy the gentleman I will give him a new one: A few minutes ago he said that no instance could be shown in which a manufacturer had appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and asked an increase of duty for his benefit. Having looked hastily over the matter, I happened to turn, in the volume of the Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, to the examination of a gentleman—a Mr. Kimes—who appeared before the committee in connection with an effort to get an increase of \$2 per ton on manufactured or wrought clay.

He was asked by Mr. BAYNE:

Why do you ask for an increase of the duty?

A. We want to be able to compensate ourselves for the depletion of the property.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

And if I had time I have no doubt I could find hundreds of instances like this.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I have excited the ire of the good-natured gentleman from Massachusetts. I was charged the other day with being "guilty of plantation manners," Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.] I suppose the gentleman from Massachusetts has given us an exhibition of "manufacturer's manners." [Laughter.] We have been told that a great deal of nonsense has been said about the manufacturers; that protection is not sought for the manufacturers at all; that the manufacturer has no desire to promote his interest and the interests of his class when he advocates protection, but he soars to a higher altitude on great questions such as this; that he rises beyond his party and his self-interest and becomes a philanthropist: that he is here to represent the great interests of labor, and not

himself. Now, we are told that self-interest is the great moving cause that actuates all mankind; but here is a distinguished philanthropist from Massachusetts who is not actuated at all by self-interest, but he is here with a heart swollen with emotion in order that he may promote the well-being and interests of the working-people of this country. He says the tariff is intended, not to enable the manufacturer to take care of himself, but to pay the wages of the workmen. I regret, sir, that the returns of our Government show that manufacturers pay \$1.25 per ton to the workingman for producing a ton of pig-iron; but the Government gives \$6.72 to the manufacturer to pay that \$1.25 with. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why do you not follow up your philanthropy and go and pay it to him? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Why do you not subordinate your self-interest as you profess to do, and take the whole of the \$6.72 and go to the hovel of the poor and give it to the poor workman for his own support and for the support of his wife and children? The official returns of the Government show that you are paid \$17 a ton for the protection of the laborer who makes steel rails, and yet you pay but \$3 to \$4 a ton to the laborer for standing over the fire and burning his life out producing it; and yet you stand up here and talk to others about frauds and misrepresentations upon this floor, and the tariff of \$17 per ton is simply protection to the laborer. Why do you not go and pay it to him? But you do not do it. You pile it up in castles along the sea-side and in Scotland and other places, and if the laborer endeavors to get it from you, you bank your fires, you lock your doors, you turn the people out into the streets, get on "tally-ho's" and ride through the mountains of Scotland and sing the philanthropic songs of her bards. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCKENNA. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a book called Merchants' Profits, by Mr. Atkinson, of Massachusetts. It is a little work that I was prompted to peruse by the reference to Mr. Atkinson made in the speech delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] in the Fiftieth Congress, in explanation of the division of profits and compensation between the workingmen and capitalist. I read.

Mr. Atkinson said:

When you buy 40 yards of cotton cloth at \$2.50 you pay the owner of the mill 15 cents profit, when you also pay about 15 cents more to other people for profit; that is 30 cents profit in all; and you pay \$2.20 directly for labor.

Now, that is the authority quoted by the gentleman from Texas himself. That is in respect to cotton goods; and of course it is just about the same as to other goods.

Further on he says, Mr. Chairman:

In other words—

Speaking about workingmen—

you can not have more than the cat and the skin. Labor now gets the cat and the owner gets the skin. That is about the end of it.

Mr. BLAND. I would like to ask the gentleman, do I understand he is claiming that 30 cents is made on an outlay of \$2.50 by the manufacturers?

Mr. MCKENNA. Of course I can not say what the gentleman understands.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. It does not matter how many times he wants it read; he wants the information.

Mr. BLAND. Did I understand you to say that it pays 30 cents profit on \$2.50 investment of the manufacturers?

Mr. MCKENNA. I will read it again, if you did not understand it the first time. But let me say, Mr. Chairman, that if the gentleman will take this little book and read it through (and that from a free-trader, too), the gentleman will not indulge in any such action as he has indulged in on the floor of this House about the unequal distribution and the division that takes place on this tariff, but he would have a good deal clearer knowledge of the question and not have to ask about it.

Mr. BLAND. That is not an answer to my question. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I hope that we may have a vote upon this paragraph, and then on the next line the gentleman may offer an amendment.

Mr. BLAND. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BURROWS. Do that on the next paragraph.

Mr. MCKINLEY. The gentleman can speak on the next paragraph.

Mr. BLAND. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "fifteen."

The question was put, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BYNUM. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 66, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

104. China, porcelain, parian, and bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware, including plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, and statuettes, painted, tinted, stained, enameled, printed, gilded, or otherwise decorated or ornamented in any manner, 60 per cent. ad valorem; if plain white, and not ornamented or decorated in any manner, 55 per cent. ad valorem.

105. All other china, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware and manufactures of the same, composed wholly or in part of earthy or mineral substances, by whatsoever designation or name known in the trade, including lava tips for burners, not specially provided for in this act, if ornamented or decorated in any manner, 60 per cent. ad valorem; if not ornamented or decorated, 55 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. DUNNELL. I move to strike out the word "fifty-five," in line 13, page 14, and insert "thirty-five." Mr. Chairman, we are now engaged in a piece of business entirely legitimate. It was expected that this Congress would revise the tariff. In fact, we are under instructions to do so. The campaign of 1888 was conducted upon the tariff question largely. The Mills bill and President Cleveland raised the issue. The Republican party accepted the issue, and the campaign was fought upon the tariff. On the Republican side it was distinctly announced that in the revision of the tariff the law or doctrine of protection should be recognized. We are, therefore, I say, legitimately at work at this hour in the revision of the tariff. I have offered an amendment to this clause, because I am under the impression that the time has come in the history of pottery manufacture in this country when there may be a reduction in the duty imposed under existing law. I was present in Congress and voted for the tariff bill of 1883, and was a member of the committee that prepared that bill.

I voted for the bill, yet I voted for it under protest. My protest was based principally upon the very large amount of money that we were collecting upon sugar; I made my fight upon the tariff bill of 1883 on the sugar clause, and I am exceedingly glad that I have the prospect before me of voting for a tariff bill that puts sugar upon the free-list. I have some views, perhaps not entertained by the majority of the gentlemen upon my side of the House, with regard to the protective policy. I believed in 1883 that we ought to protect this very industry that is now brought into debate. I voted cheerfully to do so then, because it was demonstrated to the committee that the manufacture of American pottery needed protection. It has been admitted upon the other side that under the influence of that protective rate of duty the price of crockery has largely come down. Then I have nothing to do but congratulate myself that I voted for it. My constituents upheld me in that vote and sustained me in it.

But the question now comes to my mind, whether we have not reached a point in the manufacture of this article when a reduction may or should take place. Let me go a little further. While I believe in the doctrine of protection, I have always believed that when an industry has been duly and properly fostered and protected and has got beyond the range of protection, so to speak, beyond any further need of it, it is not right to continue that protection.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLAND. If I can be recognized I will yield time to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GROSVENOR). The Chair will follow the ruling of his predecessor in the chair, and will not recognize the right of gentlemen to yield time in the five-minute debate.

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DUNNELL] be permitted to continue five minutes longer.

Mr. DUNNELL. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, but I have no desire to break the rule.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota. In the discussion of these questions it seems to be understood, and it is pretty generally believed throughout the country, that nearly every product that is protected under our laws is to-day controlled by an organization of some kind, a "combination," or an "agreement," or a "trust." But, sir, the moment we strike any particular commodity that is protected, as for instance the one under consideration, and the intimation is made that a trust has been formed upon it, or a "combination," or anything of that kind, some gentleman representing the particular interest then in question is ready to rise here and affirm that, beyond all question and beyond all doubt, his particular interest, or that which he represents on the floor, is not in a trust.

So that if we begin at the beginning of the bill and go through the whole tariff system there is not a single product, so far as I have observed, in all this discussion or in the discussion in the Fiftieth Congress, when we had the tariff under consideration—there is not a single product, not a single item that is in a trust. Evidently somebody has been playing a confidence game on the American people in this regard.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. The Democratic newspapers.

Mr. BLAND. Not only that, but there has been a confidence game played upon the House and upon the Senate of the United States upon this question; because we have had a bill sent to us from the Senate denouncing all trusts and combines and containing a provision as broad as the "general-welfare" clause of the Constitution, intended to cover everything in the nature of a trust. That bill was evidently framed because it was supposed that the whole country, from Maine to Georgia and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, was honey-combed with trusts; and yet, sir, when we come down to the particular industries in this bill and take up one after another, we find that in every case it is denied that there is any trust on the particular article; so that finally we come out of the discussion with the assurance that there is not a single trust existing in this country. [Laughter.]

I am very glad to know it. I am satisfied that the people of this country would be delighted to know that that was true. But, sir, I have some doubts upon the question. If there are no trusts organized in this country it is not because Congress does not charter them by such bills as this. If this bill had its proper title it would be "A bill authorizing the formation of trusts and combines throughout this country without limit." The only object of such a bill is to enable parties to control by combinations the markets of the American consumers.

Mr. DUNNELL. Mr. Chairman, I had not quite concluded my remarks when my time expired. I am very willing on any item in this bill to be properly instructed. I am anxious to understand the arguments which may be adduced in support of any rate of duty that may be imposed upon any given article. I received the other day a letter from a constituent of mine, of which I desire to read a portion.

I had written to him that I would send him a copy of the pending tariff bill. This gentleman has dealt in crockery for thirty years; he is an intelligent gentleman, a Republican in politics. In the letter he says:

I hope there will not be any additional duty on crockery. The duty is now more than it should be. When they reduced the tariff two or three years ago, the New Jersey and Ohio men by sharp practice had the tariff raised on crockery from 45 per cent. to 55 per cent. Twenty-five per cent. ought to protect the potteries in this country. Any institution that has made decent goods has got rich in the business.

Mr. Chairman, generally in the country, and especially in States remote from Ohio and New Jersey, where freights play a very large part in regard to heavy goods, the impression prevails that there are now large incomes derived from many industries which, under this bill, we are seeking to protect even more than they are protected by the act of 1883. Now, as a Republican, as one who secured his election to this House upon the national Republican platform, I insist that to the West there should be extended a just application of the principle of protection. When industries have been protected for a long series of years, and when the schedules or tables show there is not a pound, cask, or yard of the given article coming into the country in competition with the home product, when we have got beyond the need of protection from foreign competition, to insist under such circumstances on keeping up the old prices and the old scale of rates is an injury to the cause of just and honest protection. This pottery industry was brought into existence by the protective policy, and I am glad of it. I voted for it; but the question here is the same as in the rate on many other articles found in this bill. Wherefore keep up a tariff on any industry, infant or full grown, when that industry has got beyond the need of it?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised at the language of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], who intimated that those on this side of the Chamber who oppose this bill are Representatives of districts that have no manufacturing industries, and therefore are perhaps actuated by a malicious desire to destroy such establishments. That is a reiteration of the Republican campaign cry of 1888. Speaking for myself I say I am not the personal Representative on this floor of any manufacturing establishments, though there are many such in my Congressional district, employing hundreds of operatives and millions of capital. Be it said to the credit of these mill-owners and of those who operate the mines, furnaces, and factories of Tennessee, they are not and have not been hanging around the committee-rooms of this Capitol praying for largesses from the public Treasury.

Sir, on this floor I represent the people, without regard to wealth or poverty; but more especially do I represent the poor and the laboring people of my district, those whose entire time, owing to the onerous exactions of the tariff taxes of the last twenty-five years has been employed in eking out a humble existence, earning bread and clothes for their families. I know that the manufacturers and monopolists can take care of themselves; they can find plenty of mouthpieces here and elsewhere, and if I am especially to champion any cause it is the cause of the laboring men of my district, and it is in their behalf that I object to this schedule in particular.

But before passing to that schedule I will remark that if those on this floor who represent their own pockets and their own moneyed investments, and are therefore clamorous in support of this measure, were denied the right of voting on this bill, it would fail by 50 votes at least. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Under our oaths and the Constitution we are not entitled here to vote upon matters in which we are financially and directly interested, even when we can ease the conscience by the spurious and hypocritical pretext that our ardor is wholly inspired by a love for the laboring man, whose wages the other side claims this bill protects. Yea, verily, it is the protection the wolf gives to the lamb. It is the protection which combines to shut up factories, close furnaces, and discharge all the laborers as soon as the additional protective duties have been obtained which, excluding all outside competition, leaves the home market to its tender mercy.

We should vote as representatives of the people at large, not as the representatives of a favored few, whether they be mill-owners, mine-owners, or those who organize, own, and control the conscienceless trusts and combines. I maintain that this section of the bill as framed and presented here is intended not only to protect the home manufacturer, and in doing that to add to the cost of every article that goes into the poor man's household, but it is intended to prohibit absolutely foreign

trade. Whenever you shut off trade with the laboring people of other quarters of the world you deny to the people of our own land the opportunity of winning bread and meat; and whenever you shut out the manufactured products of Europe you shut in the products of the farms of the West and the South, the North and the East. The surplus of our farms must be exchanged in foreign markets for the surplus products of the laborers there who require our grain and meat products to sustain life.

In opposition to this schedule I have received numerous petitions from merchants in my district who protest against their trade being absolutely destroyed, against being turned over, bound hand and foot, to the pottery trust of the Union. They have sent me in their petition a list showing the amount of increases in this schedule. I find that on one of the classes of these goods—white opal globes, 5 to 7 inches wide—the tariff was increased 77 per cent. by the administrative bill which passed through this House recently, without a full and thorough investigation, under the usual gag-law, and it is increased 205 per cent. by this bill, while the present tariff is only 45 per cent., and has since 1883 been considered amply sufficient. Is this increase necessary? What is there in it except "protection run mad?"

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I move to amend by striking out the last word. I wish to say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DUNNELL] and to this Committee of the Whole that probably the product of no industry in the world is so largely the product of hand-labor as is pottery. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] spoke about the genius of the American people in cheapening processes. The fact is there is hardly any manufacture in which it is so difficult to cheapen processes as in the manufacture of pottery. To-day in the United States some kinds of pottery are being made upon wheels similar to those pictured in the tombs of the Pharaohs. In the forming of articles of delicate design there seems to be a nicety of touch about the human hand which no machine yet discovered can rival. In decoration, not only are delicacy of hand and accuracy of eye called for, but, as is also the case in the making of designs (and the world is constantly calling for some novelty in this direction), the highest artistic skill is demanded.

There is another difficulty under which this industry labors; in this country we are as yet continually testing our materials, and it is no uncommon thing to have goods destroyed because the material was not of the character supposed. Throughout the length and breadth of this country the potters have gone searching for clay; new beds are constantly being opened, and these have to be tested. Some kinds of clay stand the firing in one way and some in another, and some do not stand it at all. And these beds as they are developed show different qualities of clay, according to the different portions of the bed from which they are taken, and there is more or less loss arising from this source constantly by reason of the necessary prosecution of these experiments.

Mr. Chairman, there is another difficulty under which the manufacturers labor. The labor they employ is, with the exception of the roughest work about the kiln, skilled labor, and skilled labor of the very highest kind. The men who work at the pottery bench in my city are men of more than ordinary intelligence. Only two years ago one of them represented the district in which I live in the Legislature; and we have had them employed in various civic positions, and we know their intelligence and capacity. They receive a compensation that is necessary to secure the employment of such men, and it is higher than in some other grades of manufacture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Then I withdraw the amendment and renew it.

There is another reason for that—

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask if the motion is admissible under the rules?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is not.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I trust, then, the gentleman from New Jersey will permit some one else to occupy the floor now, and that we will not disregard the rule which we have laid down.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Very well; I will only add that their wages are none too high. The work is wearing. It is carried on in rooms which necessarily have a dampened atmosphere, and rheumatism is a frequent result. Potter's asthma is also a common complaint from the dust inhaled, and in the cases of dippers lead poisoning almost invariably occurs sooner or later.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, I renew the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DUNNELL] ought to be adopted by this committee. In this section of the schedule, by a trick in 1883, were included very nearly all of the common wares used by the masses of the people in this country. The Tariff Commission prepared a schedule, after a thorough examination of the whole question, and I do not believe that there is a member upon the Committee of Ways and Means who will question the fact that that commission was as favorably disposed to the industries of the country as it could possibly have been. Their leanings were all on the side of high duties, and I am inclined to think, although I do not know the fact,

that one member of the commission was himself a manufacturer of pottery. I may be mistaken in that.

Mr. MCKINLEY. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. BYNUM. Very well; I was not certain of it myself. At all events they examined into this question thoroughly and in all of its details. They heard both sides of the question. They investigated the industry in all of its branches, and investigated the different manufactures connected with it. They prepared, as I have already said, a schedule, which they submitted to Congress as a fair and just one, which schedule made three classifications, in the following order:

First, China, porcelain, parian, and bisque ware, including plaques, ornaments, charms, vases, and statuettes, painted, printed, and gilded, or otherwise decorated or ornamented in any manner, 65 per cent. ad valorem.

The second was—

China, porcelain, parian, and bisque ware, plain white, and not ornamented or decorated in any manner, 60 per cent. ad valorem.

And the third—

All other earthen, stone, and crockery ware, white, glazed, edged, printed, painted, dipped, or cream-colored, composed of earthy or mineral substances, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 55 per cent. ad valorem.

Now, when the bill was thrown into conference the manufacturers of pottery—and it is known full well that the people were not consulted when the bill was in conference—the manufacturers of pottery were called there to prepare their schedules. They prepared them, and this is a fair illustration of the advantage taken of the people when no discussion could be had in committee and when the whole conference was secret, at a time when the bill was brought before the House and passed without discussion, and practically without consideration. I say it shows clearly the advantages taken of the people. When that bill went into conference that last provision was virtually eliminated which allowed painted, dipped, cream-colored, and common wares to be brought in at the lowest schedule, and as a consequence, by reason of the change made, they fell under the highest schedule. This is the commonest ware; the edged ware, the sponged ware, and dipped ware. These wares really are the rejected white ware, which will not sell as pure white, worked over and a figure made in a simple manner.

This work is done largely by children. A child sits near the wheel when the work is being fashioned and stamps a sponge coated with some coloring matter on the article, which makes a figure and covers up defects by ornamentation. It is single-colored ware. It is the cheapest grade of white ware. It is, as I have said, child labor exclusively; and so with certain grades of printed ware—ware printed in a single color—they are really the rejected grade of white ware, and constitute the china of the poor men, the laboring men of the country. They come in now, instead of at the lowest rate of duty, under the highest schedule, and the user of this kind of ware has to pay the same rate of duty as is paid on the highest hand-painted chinaware that is imported.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with this proposition that tariff duties ought to be reduced where they are unreasonably high; but I think the argument made by the gentleman from Tennessee, and also the argument of the gentleman from Indiana, in regard to this particular schedule does not warrant the action that is proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota. It is not proposed in this bill to make any change in the main on the leading articles in this schedule, but to leave them as they are. The imports now, as shown by the report here of these articles, is still of the value of \$4,276,000 a year. This is quite a large sum, and certainly it shows that this is not a prohibition, but rather a protective tariff.

Now, what has been the result of the adoption of the schedule that was made in 1883 upon the consumers of this country? I have here a statement showing that the result has been favorable to the consumers. There has been a reduction in the price of a number of these articles, for instance in the case of a dinner set consisting of 125 pieces the reduction is from \$12.28 to \$8.18. On another set—a tea set of 44 pieces—the reduction is from \$2.40 to \$1.79, and on a toilet set, from \$4.24 to \$2.59. That has been accomplished, although the duty has had the result of bringing into the Treasury several millions of dollars. We have obtained from these articles of import five or six millions of dollars annually of the necessary revenues to carry on the Government, to pay for its necessary expenses, and at the same time by stimulating American industries reduced the cost of the articles to the prices I have named. Certainly it can not be said that the rates proposed here are prohibitive, for if they were I should be in favor of reducing them and allowing a change in order that we should have foreign competition as well as domestic competition in these articles.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 60, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DUNNELL. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. DUNNELL and Mr. MCKINLEY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 76, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLAND. I offer the following amendment, to come in at the end of the paragraph under consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add after line 14, page 14, the following:

"That it shall be lawful for the farmers of each State and Territory of the United States to organize or establish for themselves such agencies as they may deem expedient for the purpose of exporting, selling, and exchanging the product of the farms of the United States in foreign markets, and to import free of duty into this country all articles of commerce procured in such foreign markets by the sale or exchange of the farm products of this country: *Provided*, That all subjects of trade or commerce so imported free of duty shall be for the use and benefit of the farmers so importing the same and for their own consumption, and shall not be sold in the markets of this country in competition with like articles on which a duty shall have been paid. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to make all needful rules and regulations to properly carry into effect the foregoing provisions relating to the sale and exchange of the products of American farms in foreign markets."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, this is a modified form of the amendment which I offered the other day when a bill was under consideration. I will have printed as part of my remarks the amendment that I offered in this connection heretofore. The amendment that I offered on a former occasion provides for the exchange of products of American farms in foreign countries and the importation of articles for which the products of the farms were exchanged free of duty without any limitation. But that amendment, on a strict party vote in this House, our friends on the other side all voting against it, was voted down.

Now, I offer a modified proposition, and certainly as it is now modified no gentleman who pretends to represent a farming constituency that is languishing to-day for the want of a market for its products can vote against it. The farmers of this country are now organized and have their stores all through the country, which are organizations for the purpose of trade, and this simply enables them to extend their trading powers to other countries. It enables them to ship their surplus products and get in exchange for them such articles of commerce as they consume among themselves. These articles are to be brought in free of duty, and not to be put upon the market in competition with articles that pay a duty.

What fairer proposition can be made than that? Where is the objection that can be raised to such a proposition that permits the agriculturists of this country who export about 80 per cent. of all of our exports, by which our foreign trade is practically carried on, to exchange their surplus products for articles abroad and for such commodities as they use and consume on their farms?

Gentlemen on the other side say that these high protective duties make their commodity cheaper to the farmer.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. If that is so, the amendment itself will have no effect. I dare you to put it to the test. I deny that it makes articles cheaper here or that the tariff rates reduce the price of commodities beyond what they can be purchased at in other countries. Why not give them this poor privilege, for they are bearing all the brunt of tariff burdens in the first instance, at least, because it is on their articles of commerce that we sustain the tariff system. We bring from abroad all the imports on which the tariff is levied and the duties collected. In the first instance they pay it by advancing their commodities, so to speak.

Now, why not allow them the privilege of a drawback, the same as you permit a drawback on all articles sent out of this country. You give drawbacks on articles which are exported. Why not give it to them?

The amendment which I offered a few days ago is as follows:

That in all cases where the products of the farms of the United States shall be sent abroad to foreign markets and there exchanged for goods, wares, or merchandise, or where such goods, wares, or merchandise shall have been purchased with the avails or proceeds arising from the sales of farm products, then, and in all such cases, such goods, wares, and merchandise so purchased or exchanged for in foreign countries shall be admitted free of duty.

Sec. 2. That proof of such exports and imports herein provided for shall be made under such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out in good faith the provisions of this act; and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time to adopt and promulgate such rules.

[Here the hammer fell.]

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the first objection there is to the gentleman's proposition is that if his proposition were adopted it would abolish our tariff system altogether, and it would take away from us all the revenues that were received from that system.

Mr. BLAND. Then the gentleman admits that the farmers support the whole tariff system? [Applause on the Democratic side.] I expected to bring that out in this discussion.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I will say in regard to that, further, that the gentleman well knows that, notwithstanding we get these large duties from the imports, there is not an article produced in this country that has been protected by these tariff duties that has not been made cheaper to the consumer than it was before the tariff was imposed.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That is true as regards all other articles.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Now the gentleman admits that. Gentlemen on that side of the House have been challenged time and again to mention a single article that has not been cheapened by this protection, and they have not done so either in this Congress or in the Fiftieth Congress. Now, the apprehension of the gentleman is—

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I have but little time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Has it also increased the price of farm products?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I am very certain that, considering the cheapness of the farm products as they are produced to-day on account of the machinery that has been invented to aid the farmer, the prices of farm products are vastly better to-day than at any time before.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then the tariff has increased the price of farm products?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I think the tariff has unquestionably increased the prices.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then the gentleman has his answer. He demanded some point where there was such an increase and he has got it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I was going to say in regard to this matter that the utterance of the gentleman from Missouri as to not being able to exchange our products has no foundation, for, notwithstanding this protection, we are still importing more and more every year. I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read the increase in our imports during all these years, showing that from 1867 they have increased from \$300,000,000 to \$741,000,000 in the last year; so that his apprehension is groundless.

Imports entered for consumption and duties collected thereon.

Year ending—	Values.				Amounts of duty collected.	Average ad valorem rate of ordinary duty on—		Duty collected per capita of population.
	Free.	Dutiable.	Total.	Per cent. of free.		Dutiable.	Free and dutiable.	
June 30—						Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
1867.....	\$17,033,130	\$361,125,563	\$378,158,693	4.50	\$168,503,750	46.67	44.56	4.65
1868.....	15,147,618	329,061,302	344,208,920	4.40	100,532,779	48.63	46.49	4.34
1869.....	21,692,532	372,756,642	394,449,174	5.50	176,557,584	47.22	44.65	4.68
1870.....	20,214,105	406,131,905	426,346,010	4.74	191,513,974	47.08	42.23	4.96
1871.....	40,619,064	459,597,058	500,216,122	8.12	202,446,673	43.05	38.94	5.12
1872.....	47,683,747	512,735,287	560,419,034	8.51	212,619,105	41.35	37.00	5.23
1873.....	178,399,796	484,746,861	663,146,657	26.90	184,929,042	38.07	26.95	4.43
1874.....	151,694,834	415,748,093	567,442,927	26.73	160,522,285	38.53	26.88	3.74
1875.....	146,465,463	379,795,113	526,260,576	27.83	154,554,983	40.62	28.20	3.51
1876.....	140,561,381	324,024,926	464,586,307	30.26	145,178,603	44.74	30.19	3.22
1877.....	140,840,149	298,989,240	439,829,389	32.02	128,428,343	42.89	26.68	2.77
1878.....	141,339,059	297,083,409	438,422,468	32.24	127,195,159	42.75	27.13	2.79
1879.....	142,550,159	296,742,215	439,242,374	32.45	133,396,436	44.87	28.97	2.78
1880.....	208,049,180	419,506,091	627,555,271	33.15	182,747,654	43.48	29.07	3.64
1881.....	202,557,412	448,061,588	650,619,000	31.13	193,800,880	43.20	29.75	3.76
1882.....	210,721,981	505,491,967	716,213,948	29.42	216,138,916	42.66	30.11	4.09
1883.....	206,913,289	493,916,384	700,829,673	29.52	210,637,293	42.45	29.92	3.89
1884.....	211,280,265	456,295,124	667,575,389	31.65	190,282,836	41.61	28.44	3.42
1885.....	192,912,234	386,667,820	579,580,054	33.28	178,151,601	45.86	30.59	3.12
1886.....	211,530,759	413,779,055	625,309,814	33.83	189,410,448	45.55	30.13	3.24
1887.....	233,093,659	450,323,322	683,416,981	34.11	214,222,310	47.10	31.02	3.60
1888.....	244,104,852	468,143,774	712,248,626	34.27	216,042,256	45.63	29.99	3.44
1889.....	256,574,630	484,856,768	741,431,398	34.61	220,576,989	45.13	29.50	3.41

Mr. DOCKERY was recognized.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Let us have a vote upon this paragraph.

Mr. McMILLIN. I want to offer an amendment to this paragraph.

Mr. DOCKERY. I hope all this is not coming out of my time. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment of my colleague [Mr. BLAND], which I understand is pending, and in the line of that amendment desire to submit a statement. In the record of yesterday's debate I find that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] used this language:

While in his speech the other day the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] sneered at the proposition that the proposed increase in duty upon agricultural products would benefit the farmer, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FIRCH] complained bitterly because the proposed increase meant that his constituents must pay more money for their meat, bread, and potatoes. Both gentlemen were making speeches for their respective districts, and not for the country at large. The gentleman from Missouri, whose constituents are largely farmers, aimed to convey the impression that the farmer would not be benefited, while the gentleman from New York, who represents the importers of foreign products of all kinds, said his people objected to the increase of duty because it would increase the price his friends must pay for their food.

Sir, there is no conflict whatever between the gentleman from New York and myself. What I did say on this question is found on page 4634 of the RECORD, and was said in reply to an interrogatory propounded by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE]:

Mr. MORSE. Will the honorable gentleman allow me to ask him a question there?

Mr. DOCKERY. With pleasure.

Mr. MORSE. Does the gentleman pretend to say to the country that we have no competition in agricultural products coming from Canada?

Mr. DOCKERY. I am obliged to the gentleman for the question, because it suggests another injustice in the operations of the existing tariff system.

The Western farmers have not been confronted with foreign competition in their home market, and no argument of the gentleman—it matters not how eloquent—can convince them to the contrary. The only agricultural competition worthy of the slightest consideration is manifest either on the Rio Grande or the Canadian border.

The effect of the tariff, therefore, as may be plainly seen, is to burden the Western farmer without any compensating advantage, whilst at the same time it operates as a tax upon the Eastern farmer and those who labor in all the varied avocations along the line of our border, for the reason that they are compelled to pay the duty upon all their agricultural imports. In other words, it is cheaper for them to pay the duty upon agricultural products than it is to pay railroad transportation. In all such cases the duty is added to the cost of the article and paid by those who consume the imported agricultural products.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have my views on this question sustained by so distinguished a gentleman as Mr. ALLISON, of Iowa, now a Senator from that State, who in this body, on the 24th of March, 1870, made the following declaration upon the issue raised by the gentleman from North Dakota:

The agricultural interest, it will be seen, is much the largest interest in its aggregate product as well as in the number of persons employed.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. How long ago was that?

Mr. DOCKERY. March 24, 1870.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Oh, twenty years ago!

Mr. DOCKERY. Yes, sir; but the conditions surrounding the farmer then were far more favorable than they are now, and therefore the argument of the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. ALLISON, is more forceful in support of my position than it would be if it were uttered to-day for the first time. He said further:

I believe no one will claim that this large interest is directly protected. It is true that under customs laws there is a small duty upon wheat, barley, oats, and other agricultural products, but it does not afford any protection to the great wheat and grain producing regions of the country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Wilson], in discussing this question, stated that the cost of wheat in New England is about \$1.70 per bushel, while in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin the price is about 65 cents per bushel. The Canadian wheat is the only wheat that comes in competition with our own. Canada being nearer New England than the wheat-growing States more than makes up the duty in the reduced cost of transportation.

What is true of wheat is equally true of other grains. Therefore the farmer has practically no protection at all, and whatever benefit he derives is from what the home market furnishes for home products. Unfortunately for the farmer, the market price of wheat is fixed by the price which the surplus will bring abroad, or the price of wheat in London or Liverpool. At that market, where the surplus is sold, and which fixes the value of the whole crop, it comes in competition with the grain produced in the Crimea, in Hungary, and in the region of the Baltic, from fields cultivated by what is known, in comparison with our own, as pauper labor.

But I am told we must so legislate as to furnish a home market for all our agricultural products, and this can only be done by high tariff. Any one examining the subject will see our agricultural products increase more rapidly than our population, so that if we do not export these products in their natural condition we must do so by converting them into manufactured articles and export these articles. But this can not be done under a high tariff, for all nations will buy manufactured products where they are the cheapest, and the nation selling the cheapest will control the market. This rule excludes our highly taxed manufactures made from highly taxed materials from the markets of the world, although we have natural advantages possessed by no other nation.

Mr. Chairman, that was the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] at a time when agricultural products commanded better prices than to-day, and it thoroughly sustains both the views of the gentleman from New York and myself.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last

word. Before the amendment presented by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] was offered I was discussing this schedule, and I call attention now to the article of student-lamp chimneys which under the present tariff pay a duty of 45 per cent. This is a cheap, ordinary glass chimney that goes upon the lamp of every poor man in the country, the men who can not afford private gas machines or private electric-light plants paid for by the profits derived from protected manufacturing enterprises.

Now, sir, how does this bill propose to deal with these common glass chimneys? It raises the tariff on them from 45 per cent. to 450 per cent. A chimney which costs now 60 cents a dozen will cost after this bill becomes a law \$3.30 a dozen. And yet gentlemen upon the other side say that the protective tariff does not enhance the cost of the manufactured article. If that be so, then in the name of God why do you raise the tariff to 450 per cent. on a common glass chimney? If your theory is correct, the raising of the duty to 450 per cent., instead of making the cost of a 60-cent chimney \$3.30 per dozen, ought to reduce the price to 10 cents per dozen. The poor man who supports the Republican party and its protective policy under this belief will soon find how woefully he is deluded.

Sir, the tariff is designed to benefit the trusts. If it does not enhance the selling price of their commodities, why do you raise it? If it reduces the price of commodities, why do the manufacturers clamor for an increase? How long since they have desired to wipe out the margin of their own profits?

Sir, I repeat, the tariff is designed to benefit the trusts and it does benefit the trusts, and in benefiting the trusts you rob the farmer, you rob the man who has no protection, the man whom you strike down when you vote against the amendment of my friend from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] which proposes to allow the farmer to export his corn and wheat or the other products of his farm, and get in return for them the product of some other man's labor upon the other side of the ocean.

The proposition offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] the other day was voted down on the ground that it allowed the purchaser of the farmers' surplus, and not the farmer himself, to reap the advantage of a rebate of the import duties on goods for which farm products had been exchanged abroad. The proposition of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] recognizes the perfect organization of the farmers in the Wheel, Alliance, Grange, and other similar associations, and authorizes these associations in their corporate capacity to export the products of the farm, exchange them abroad for things we need, and allow such articles to come in duty free. As such it shall have my vote, and ought to have the support of every gentleman on this floor who has the interest of farmers and laborers at heart. It is true that he is allowed to exchange his product with some laborer in what is called the protected home market, but there are not mouths enough in this country to consume much more than half of what the farmers of this country produce, and on the balance of his products the American farmer has to meet the competition of all the world.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order. The gentleman from Tennessee is discussing the glass schedule, which we have not yet reached.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Oh, I will confine myself sufficiently to the amendment to satisfy even the technical soul of the gentleman from Iowa. I will not make any points of order on him when he gets up to take part in this discussion. This interruption, I imagine, is merely for the purpose of taking up my time. The gentleman from Iowa in this House reminds me of a standing interrogation-point. He is constantly asking a question of some other member on the floor or of the Chair, and in that way he consumes the time of other members and of the House when he had better be devoting himself to the interests of his constituents. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I am devoting myself to the interests of my constituents.

Mr. WASHINGTON. He was sent here to do what he could to relieve them from oppressive and burdensome taxation, and he is constant in his protestations that he desires to do that; yet every day, when there is a roll-call or a vote of any kind, we find him raising his voice with the other side in furtherance of all their high-tariff and high-tax schemes.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Because it is the right side.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, on this question of the duty on lamp chimneys, if the tariff reduces the cost of the article instead of increasing it, this proposed tariff of 450 per cent. ought to reduce the price of these chimneys, so that instead of costing \$3.30 a dozen they ought to sell for 10 cents a dozen and go a-begging at that. But you will see, sir, what the effect will be upon the cost of these articles if this bill should become a law.

Looking further down the schedule which I hold in my hand, I find that this china schedule covers even the poor man's tumbler, that article out of which he drinks his buttermilk after a hard day's labor in the field. On that it increases the tariff 75 per cent. The poor, light, cheap tumbler which now retails at 60 cents per dozen will be so increased by this tariff that it will cost \$1.05 per dozen. That means that it will take nearly twice as many dozen eggs, twice as many

pounds of butter, twice as many chickens to purchase the humble glass which decorates the poor man's table.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have read as part of my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Republic, to show how the farmers of this country are prospering, as compared with the manufacturing industries.

The Clerk read as follows:

WHERE THE MONEY IS.

It is pretty well known that when one of those revulsions in business, called panics, comes over the country money disappears in the West and goes to the East, finding its hiding places in the bank vaults, safe deposits, and money drawers of the manufacturing States. Farm values and crop prices fall, farms become unsalable, and farmers find it impossible to pay their debts or to borrow money, and are forced to stagger along in half despair for several years till times grow better. The explanation of this disagreeable phenomenon is that the manufacturing States control the money of the country; they are the creditor States, while the Western and Southern States are debtors; they are money-lenders, while the other States are money-borrowers; they hold mortgages on a third of the property of the West and South, and there is a perpetual drain of money from all other States and Territories into them to pay the interest on these enormous claims.

The last report of the Comptroller of the Currency furnishes some interesting information on the distribution of money in the country, in a table showing the amount of capital, surplus, undivided profits, and individual deposits in banks of all kinds, for every State and Territory of the Union. A compendium of the table is given in the following statement:

CAPITAL, DEPOSITS, ETC., IN THE NINE MANUFACTURING STATES.

Maine.....	\$71,516,000
New Hampshire.....	79,281,000
Vermont.....	36,000,000
Massachusetts.....	691,000,000
Rhode Island.....	113,448,000
Connecticut.....	188,316,000
New York.....	1,585,800,000
New Jersey.....	104,367,000
Pennsylvania.....	508,567,000
Total.....	\$3,378,295,000
All other States and Territories.....	\$1,823,376,000
Population of the nine manufacturing States.....	17,000,000
Population of all other States and Territories.....	47,000,000
Per capita in the manufacturing States.....	\$198
Per capita in other States and Territories.....	\$40

It will be seen that protected manufacturing has given the nine States of the Northeast control of the banks, banking power, and money of the country. They have only about one-fourth the population of the country, but they own over three-fifths of the banking capital and deposits. The per capita is \$198 for them and only \$40 for the other States and Territories. Massachusetts alone (\$691,540,000) has more than the eight States of Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, and Colorado put together. New Hampshire, with a population of only 381,000, has as much (\$79,281,762) as the two States of Indiana (\$63,852,000) and North Carolina (\$12,160,000) with an aggregate population of 4,000,000; and Rhode Island, with a population of only 343,000, has (\$113,448,036) more than Georgia (\$27,299,000), South Carolina (\$12,000,000), Alabama (\$15,600,000), Mississippi (\$10,000,000), Louisiana (\$29,000,000), and West Virginia (\$8,831,000), with an aggregate population of 8,000,000.

It will be said in explanation of this unequal distribution of the money wealth of the country that, while the manufacturing States have a large share of their wealth in money, the farming States have theirs chiefly in farms, cities, towns, and railroads. This statement is true, but the force of it is broken by another very important fact, namely: That nearly all the railroads of the farming States and one-fourth their farms, cities, and towns are mortgaged—and the mortgages are held chiefly in the manufacturing States. Indeed, the manufacturing States own not only three-fifths of the money of the country, but a full fourth, and probably one-third, of the wealth in the other States and Territories besides.

[Here the hammer fell].

Many MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. BLAND, there were—ayes 62, noes 76.

Mr. BLAND. Let us have tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. BLAND and Mr. MCKINLEY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 59, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move to amend by striking out, in clause 104, lines 11 and 12 of page 14, the word "sixty" and inserting "forty-five," so as to make the duty 45 per cent. ad valorem. This paragraph covers the species of ware mentioned a few moments ago by the gentleman from Minnesota, and I think the duty is excessive. The committee in their estimate hold that there is no increase of duty by the change in this bill. The object of my amendment is to prevent any increase of duty. The present rate is 60 per cent., and under the existing law there is no duty imposed on the coverings, crates, etc., in which the goods are brought into the country.

But it will be remembered that only a few weeks ago we passed a bill which was sent to the Senate providing for a duty on coverings. When that bill becomes a law the effect will be, taking that and this measure together (if the country should sustain the misfortune of this bill being enacted into law), an increase of duty on this class of goods. There is no member of this House who has yet said that there ought to be an increase. There is no member of the committee, I will undertake to say, who will rise and say there should be an increase. Yet, from the operation of these two bills, if they should become law, an increase will inevitably result. Instead of the importer taking \$120

to the custom-house, paying \$60 to the Government and \$60 for the goods, he will have to pay this amount, plus the coverings, cartons, etc. Now I wish to know whether any gentleman on the other side will, in the face of these facts, advocate an increase of duty on this class of goods.

It will be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that by the act of 1883 there was an increase in this schedule. I do not remember about this particular class of goods, but there was a change in this schedule. That change was made, as will be remembered, upon a statement that in order to give the amount of protection required by American labor it was necessary there should be an increase; yet it is a part of history, not denied in the last campaign, not denied on this floor, and it will not be denied, I presume, that after the duty had been increased by Congress the manufacturers forced a reduction in the wages of their laborers. I have offered this amendment for the purpose, as I stated in the beginning, of preventing an increase in the rate of duty here.

Mr. MCKINLEY. As I understand, the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee proposes to strike out "sixty," in line 11, paragraph 104, and insert "forty-five," so as to make the duty 45 per cent. on these decorated goods.

Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said about the additional duties which will arise in connection with this industry by reason of the administrative bill which has passed this House and the Senate and is now in conference. That there will be some increase from that administrative bill when it shall become a law, no gentleman familiar with the subject will for a moment deny. There is very much disagreement as to the amount of that increase. There was very much disagreement at the time the Tariff Commission was in session as to what the removal of the duties upon packages would amount to, just as there is now a considerable division of views as to the effect in percentage which the re-enactment of the package clause will bring about with reference to this class of articles. I have looked into this matter with the very greatest care, and my own judgment is that the increase of duties on this kind of ware by the administrative bill will be between 4 and 5 per cent.

In the debate on the tariff bill of 1883 it was said—and the remark has been quoted here—that by the provision in that act removing the package clause the amount of reduction would be from 10 to 13 or 17 per cent. That was said in the debate, but it was wild talk, as was afterwards proved when we finally passed upon that clause of the statute.

Now, it must be remembered that under our tariff law prior to 1883 there were included in what was termed the package clause inland transportation and commission. Those items are eliminated by the present administrative bill which is soon to become a law. The duties under the law as we propose to amend it in the administrative bill are upon the cost of packing and transportation to the port of exportation, and my best information is that the addition will not be more than 4 to 5 per cent. in the whole range of this class of goods; it may amount to less.

Gentlemen make their calculations in regard to this percentage from the invoices that have been made since 1883. But the very instant we put packages upon the free-list, that very instant men who invoiced goods from the other side increased the valuation of the packages and diminished the valuation of the contents. So your invoices to-day would show that packages are anywhere from 10 to 15 and 20 per cent. of the entire importation. Why? Because packages being free and the goods having been bought by the importer already packed, contents and all, he puts just such a valuation upon the package as he sees fit; as he has to pay duty upon the contents, he diminishes the value of the contents by increasing the value of the package, which is a fraud not only upon the revenues of the Government, but upon our domestic manufactures. And I am here to say that this increase of duty of 5 per cent., if that is what it amounts to, is absolutely needed to maintain this industry in the United States.

We need it for what? Not for the manufacturers, but we need it for the labor that is employed in this great industry of the country. Why, Mr. Chairman, 90 per cent. of the cost of this crockeryware is human labor, labor in the mine in preparing the clay, then the hand labor in the factory from the raw material up to the finished product; and that labor, let me state to the committee, is 113 per cent. more in the United States than it is in any other competing country of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.] We paid last year in wages alone for the ten millions of our product all the wages that were paid abroad, with the American duty added of more than \$3,000,000. We paid to our workmen just as much as was paid for the imported articles, duty added. That duty is from 55 to 60 per cent.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that all the while—for I have but a moment—all the while that this duty has been in force we have been diminishing the price of this commodity to the consumers of this country. My friend from Minnesota [Mr. DUNNELL] referred to the fact that in 1883 he helped to increase this duty and says he congratulates himself for having done it because that increase diminished the price to his constituents. I tell him now, as I told him in the Forty-seventh Congress, that if you will put on the duty we propose to-day by this bill, in less than five years we will not only increase our manufact-

ures at home, but improve the character of our work, and we will reduce the cost still further to the American consumer so as to bring it within the reach of all. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, it is very well to talk in the air and to claim that all of this increase proposed by the pending bill is for the benefit of the labor of the country. But I propose to put before the people of the country the statistics from authentic sources, derived from the reports of the Superintendent of the Census, Mr. Seaton, to show the actual labor cost of the manufactured products entering into consumption in this country.

Mr. McKINLEY. And I will do the same in my remarks, with the permission of the committee. I happen to have them here before me.

Mr. McMILLIN. The last census was taken under a Republican administration.

Mr. GEAR. And honestly taken.

Mr. McMILLIN. I am glad these figures are admitted to be honest. The Superintendent of the Census, Mr. Charles W. Seaton, compiled a table showing the labor cost in the various manufacturing industries of this country, and in connection with the manufactures now under consideration he puts it down as follows:

Stone and earthen ware: The value of the product manufactured in the United States was \$7,942,729 in the census year 1880. The amount paid for labor was \$3,279,523, and the per cent. paid to labor was consequently 41.3.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the amount that labor gets. This is the amount that labor is alleged to have got. That is as much as it can be claimed that it did get, and yet every laborer throughout this land is called upon to pay to the manufacturer of these articles at the rate of 60 per cent. under this bill even if there were no increase made in the rate by the bill which was recently passed by the House and sent to the Senate.

Why do you propose to give more than 60 per cent. duty if you are working only for the laborer, when the labor cost was only 41.3 per cent.?

The gentleman says that increase made in the administrative bill now in the Senate was from 4 to 5 per cent. Taking him at his word, then, the net result of tariff legislation in this Congress, if this bill shall become a law, will be an increase upon the ware used by the households of the land—the earthen and glass ware of the ordinary kind used—of 5 per cent., making the duty 64 or 65 per cent. And remember that labor cost only 41 per cent. at the outside.

But what will not be claimed in the name of the American laboring man? Now, I will try the gentleman a little later on and see if he is willing for the people of the United States to get even a continuance of the present rate of duty. He will have an opportunity of placing himself on record on that proposition.

But has my charge, that immediately after the rate of duty was raised by the act of 1883 there was a decrease in the price of wages, paid to the workingman engaged in the production of earthenware been met? Has any gentleman from New Jersey or elsewhere risen to deny the fact? Will any gentleman be rash enough to do so in the face of the current history of the country? I presume not. So at the same time that the tariff was raised the wages were reduced; and still the gentleman says that the increase proposed here is necessary for the benefit of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I only want to call the attention of the committee to this kind of ware I hold in my hand. [Exhibiting a cup and saucer.] This is the quality of ware that the gentleman proposes to reduce to 45 per cent., the very finest balisque ware made in this country, a ware that we can not make profitably until we increase the duties imposed by the act of 1883, a ware that is not used at the present time by the common people of the country at all, but in a short while it will be accessible to them by reason of the cheaper price at which it can be produced if we adopt the provisions suggested by the pending bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That elegant ware the other side of the House propose to strike down; they propose to prevent the successful manufacture of it in this country. We make it with our own skill, from our own material, and we propose this duty because we mean to serve our own countrymen and benefit our own firesides, while you would serve the alien, the stranger. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

I append some tables show the selling prices of these various goods in several years:

Relative prices of white granite or white stoneware (the ware used by the millions).

Articles.	English ware, 1880 (duty 24 per cent.).	American ware, 1890 (duty 55 per cent.).
Dinner set (125 pieces).....	\$12.28	\$8.18
Tea set (44 pieces).....	2.40	1.79
Toilet set, complete (12 pieces).....	4.24	2.59

Net selling prices of standard staple patterns of American decorated iron-stone china-ware, as sold to the trade in 1878, 1883, and 1890.

Articles.	1878.	1883.	1890.
12-piece toilet set:			
Decorated, moss rose, gold edge and trimmings.....	\$13.25	\$7.75 to \$10.00	\$4.50 to \$5.00
Decorated, gold band, gold edge and trimmings.....	10.00	7.75 to 10.00	4.50 to 5.00
Decorated, colored band, gold edge and trimmings.....	10.90	6.50	3.90
Decorated, colored band, colored edge and trimmings.....	7.00	5.50	3.75
Plain white granite.....	4.71	3.44	2.90
10-piece toilet set, plain white granite (no slop-jar).....	2.53	1.86	1.56
56-piece tea set:			
Decorated, moss rose, gold trimmings.....	11.75	6.75	3.50
Decorated, gold band, gold trimmings.....	10.00	6.75	3.50
Plain white granite (or ironstone china).....	3.25	2.38	2.00
125-piece dinner set:			
Decorated, moss rose, gold trimmings.....	46.70	27.00	14.20
Decorated, gold band, gold trimmings.....	40.60	27.00	14.20
Plain white granite (or ironstone china).....	13.20	9.58	8.12

12-piece toilet set consists of 1 ewer, 1 basin, 1 mouth ewer, 3 soaps, 1 vase, 2 covered chambers, 1 mug, 2 slop-jars; 56-piece tea set consists of 3 tea-pots, 2 sugars, 1 cream, 1 slop-bowl, 2 bread-plates, 12 plates (6-inch), 12 fruits, 12 cups, 12 saucers; 125-piece dinner set consists of regular standard assortment.

Freight rates from the Ohio Valley potteries (East Liverpool, Wheeling, etc.) to the principal distributing markets of the United States as compared with sea-freights from Liverpool, England, to those markets.

To—	From Ohio Valley potteries.	Sea-freight from Liverpool, England.
	Per ton.*	Shillings.† Per ton.*
New York.....	\$4.20	6 to 10 = \$3.84
Philadelphia.....	3.80	10 = 4.80
Baltimore.....	3.60	7½ = 3.60
Boston.....	4.80	5 = 2.40
New Orleans.....	11.60	10 = 4.80
Galveston.....	17.20	15 = 7.20
San Francisco.....	32.00	9 to 10½ = 4.80

* 2,000 pounds.

† For 40 cubic feet.

The above rates of sea-freights are taken from J. Edwards & Co., of Liverpool, England, who issue a circular weekly. All sea-freights being on a basis of 40 cubic feet to the ton, we have made calculations to make it equivalent to our 2,000-pound ton, estimating 40 cubic feet of pottery ware to weigh 1,000 pounds, which estimate is correct.

England is now shipping goods to many internal points direct, to wit: St. Louis, Kansas City, Mobile, etc., at rates as low and lower than we can; but, rates not being published, can not give the figures except by hearsay.

Mr. BYNUM. I move to strike out the last word. No better illustration, Mr. Chairman, and no greater contrast between the two systems as exhibited here by the two sides in regard to this question of protection, and the interests they represent, could be presented than the exhibition just made by the gentleman from Ohio who has taken his seat. Upon his desk are samples of the finest decorated wares that are used by the wealthy classes of the country, and which wares are included in the section of the bill now under consideration; while in the last Congress I brought into this House and exhibited the very cheapest ware, printed ware, edged ware, sponged ware, and that class that is necessarily used by the laboring people of the country; yet this class of wares is compelled to pay the same rate of duty as the finest grade that is produced in the country.

Sir, the poor men of this country are paying 60 per cent. upon wares that do not cost one-tenth that the wares that the gentleman has exhibited do, and you have them side by side at the same duty, and you propose to keep them there in this schedule.

Mr. McKINLEY. And he gets them lower all the time.

Mr. BYNUM. Yes, they get lower all the time. They have got the prices down so that the poor man can discharge the tin plate. The gentleman talks about increasing the tariff for the benefit of the working and laboring man. The gentleman from Tennessee has answered that partially; but I desire to call his attention specifically to the fact that in 1883, when the tariff was raised, when the duty was raised on pressed glass and bottles under the act of 1883, the manufacturers called a meeting of their employes and made a reduction of 10 per cent., and one of my constituents complained very bitterly because he said they reduced the size of the bottle at the same time. [Laughter.] Now, the duties upon earthenware prior to this time, from 1857 until 1861, were 25 and 30 per cent. From that to 1864 they were 25 and 40 per

cent. and 25 and 40 per cent. up to 1872. They were increased by an internal-revenue tax of 10 per cent. placed upon manufacturers, and, to compensate the manufacturers for that increase in the internal revenue, 5 per cent. more was added. The internal revenue was stricken off afterwards, but the 5 per cent. to compensate them for that has never been stricken off.

The gentleman speaks of this increase being for the benefit of labor. In 1878 a petition was sent by the operatives of glass manufactures in the city of Trenton. Here is what they said in that petition to Congress in 1878:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

We, the operative potters of the city of Trenton, being convinced by experience that a high rate of duty on crockery-ware yields no benefit financially to the workingman and is inimical to his interests in its effects in increasing the price of living generally, respectfully petition your honorable bodies for such a revision of the tariff as will reduce the rates on crockery to a revenue basis.

We respectfully submit that the only plea upon which a high protective tariff can be justified is that it enables the manufacturer to pay better wages to the laborer than he receives in European countries, and that the artisan thus shares in the benefit of a higher price which protection allows the manufacturer to obtain. This not being the case, a tariff levied in the name of "protection to American industries" is a false pretense and a delusion.

It is highly injurious to the workingman when his fair share of its benefits are withheld and all its benefits are appropriated by the manufacturer, because it strengthens the task-master while, its indirect results being to increase the price of all necessities, it weakens the task-doer.

In its practical operation it is monopoly for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many.

Such being our experience, and believing that, with the exception of the privileged few, who reap its fruit, a high tariff entails disadvantages for which it offers no compensation, we respectfully ask for such a reduction as will destroy monopoly and encourage healthy competition; and your petitioners will, as in duty bound, ever pray, etc.

In 1878 the men who worked in the potteries, in whose name 60, 70, 80, and 100 per cent. on common grades of earthenware is demanded, asked for a reduction of over 40 per cent., because they said they did not get anything out of it.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I renew the formal amendment simply for the purpose of saying a word in response to what has been said by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM]. Two years ago when a candidate for a seat in this House I made my canvass on a strong protective tariff platform and addressed assemblies of workmen in every part of my district, and especially in my own city. Those meetings in my city were attended very largely indeed by the operatives of the potteries. I told them I was in favor of a protective rate on pottery. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] came to my city during that canvass to explain the effect and operation of his bill and did explain it, and the result of that election was that I got the largest majority I ever got in my life. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. And the Democratic party in New Jersey made a large gain.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Oh, no, the Democratic workmen voted for me because they wanted protection on the products of their labor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I said that there was a large increase in the Democratic vote in New Jersey.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Oh, you refer to last fall, and you take in Hudson County. That we have uncovered lately. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the gentleman that when I arrived in his city the first visitors that came to me at the hotel were the men in the potteries, who complained that, while the manufacturers of pottery claimed that protection was necessary for their workmen, as my friend has stated, as soon as the tariff bill increasing the duties was passed they reduced the pay of the workmen.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Precisely so; and the gentleman made his speech, and after he went away they said: "Judge, if that is all Mr. MILLS can say in favor of his bill, we are for you." [Applause on the Republican side.] And they were on election day. The returns showed it.

It has been so often stated here that this duty is a tax upon the consumer that I feel it my duty to give a few facts and figures in connection with this matter. Under the act of March 3, 1857, earthenware bore a uniform duty of 24 per cent. By the present law decorated ware bears a duty of 60 per cent. and undecorated 55 per cent. It is but a matter of history that under the lower duty scarcely any pottery ware, either white or decorated, was made in this country. Under the higher rate imposed by the acts of 1863, 1866, 1867, and later, the industry was established here, and has grown until now we have 80 potteries, with 401 kilns and 188 decorating kilns, employing 16,900 persons and making more than one-half of the crockery used in the United States.

Before this industry was started here we were at the mercy of other countries as to the price they would sell us crockery for. With this industry here we have a competition, and the usual results of competition are apparent. Crockery sells now for a price from one-third to one-half lower than it did under the old low-tariff rates.

Why, sir, under those old rates the business of making potteryware in Europe for the American market was an exceedingly profitable one. The business of importing it for sale was also an exceedingly profitable

one. I am assured by a gentleman of intelligence and reliability, formerly in the importing business, that before the American factories started up the importers often realized a profit of from 50 to 100 per cent., and what was to hinder? This whole country was dependent upon them alone for its supply of these goods, and they could charge just what they pleased.

Now, another source of supply equally as large has been opened to the people right here at their own doors, and the inevitable result has followed. To-day the foreign manufacturer makes his goods for this market at a narrower margin and the importer has to be content with a smaller profit. The tariff has not been added to the cost of the article, but it has come out of that which before was pocketed as profits. The whole history of the operations of tariff systems shows that this result inevitably follows wherever there is a large home production to compete with the foreign importation.

I have been assured by a gentleman formerly employed as an invoice clerk in Europe that he has there often made out invoices for goods to be sent here at a much lower figure since our high tariff rates have been in operation than was exacted for goods to be sent to countries having a low tariff or none at all. In the one case the foreign maker reduced his profits; in the other he charged the full profit. The question is often asked, "If this result follows and goods become cheapened to the consumer, why do you want a protective rate?" It might well be said in reply: "If you can not deny that this result follows, why need you care, so long as you get cheaper goods? Why bother yourselves about processes so long as you receive the benefits of results?"

But another answer is at hand. A protective rate is needed to secure a permanency of the market here, so necessary to the maintenance of the home production. All the industrial world knows that a permanency of market at reasonable rates is in the long run far preferable to a spasmodic market, with exceedingly profitable rates at times and entire stagnation at others.

That factory that can have an even, steady flow of orders, running the year round, can fill those orders at a much smaller margin of profit than it could if the orders came in heavily for a short time and then ceased for a period. Business men can adjust themselves to a steady business and know just how to shape affairs so as to utilize to the best advantage their productive facilities when they can with a fair degree of certainty foresee the future. Low tariffs permit the dumping here at any unforeseen moment of the surplus of all the workshops of all Europe and Asia.

The extra \$2,000,000 of crockery imported in the three summer months of 1883 upset things here, so that it took at least two years for our pottery industry to recover from its effects. No pottery plant can pay now only a few months in the year, even if it sells its ware at a large profit.

Now, sir, as to another matter: One gentleman says that 60, 70, 80, and 100 per cent. on common grades of earthenware is demanded. In reply I reiterate that this bill does not raise the rates and that by the administrative bill the duty on coverings will be but a very small matter. The administrative bill does not include inland freights; it does include all charges upon the goods until ready for shipment, but it includes no charge whatever for shipment. To say that the administrative bill will add materially to the duty is simply to make an assertion.

No 100, 80, or 70 per cent. rate is demanded. It is true that it is asserted in the circular which has been sent, I presume, to all of us, that such demand is made, but I do not hesitate to pronounce the statements in that circular as to earthenware entirely unworthy of credit. The very fact that it is anonymous shows that no man dared father its statements. If the compiler believed them himself, why did he hesitate to give the sanction of his name to its statements? I have generally found, however, that a man who writes an anonymous letter seldom has such a name in the community as to add any strength to his production.

This circular has been sent all over the country, and every effort made to mislead the people by it. I am proud to say that not one has, to my knowledge, been indorsed in the district I have the honor to represent. Certainly they have not been returned to me.

I have said there is no pottery trust in this country. Yet gentlemen still speak of the pottery trust. I again say there is none. I challenge the strictest investigation of this question. Two years ago the term was used in the tariff debate. It was false then. It is false now.

[Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana, withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I shall occupy the time of the committee but a moment. I desire to put on record at this time a denial of a statement which has been once or twice repeated upon the other side of the House during the discussion of this paragraph. That statement is that immediately following upon the passage of the tariff act of 1883, increasing the rates of duty upon the articles included in this paragraph, the manufacturers turned the screws upon their workmen and reduced their wages.

I say that that is not so. I say there is no testimony bearing out that statement. I say there are no facts to support it. I venture to

state—and I believe that the history of this industry following the act of 1883 warrants me in the statement—that the same wages were continued, or that wages were increased from the passage of the act of 1883 down to 1885, when an importation of a line of goods expensive in labor was made from across the water at a great reduction of cost. It was found impossible to compete with that line of goods except by a reduction of the cost of production here. Only 1 per cent. of the entire cost of this manufacture is raw material. The balance of it is labor. Therefore there was but one way to meet the issue.

A conference with the workmen was asked by the manufacturers, when all the facts were laid before the men who worked in the factories. Mr. Powderly was sent for and the manufacturers said to him: "Here, take our books, investigate the facts, take the wages, take the cost of foreign labor, and give us your figures and we will abide by your decision in the matter;" and Mr. Powderly fixed the rate of wages upon that line of goods, and that is how the reduction was made. But I say to this House, and I want it to go to the country in this connection, that the testimony taken by the Ways and Means Committee in this Congress, and the testimony taken by the Finance Committee of the Senate in the last Congress, proved that the rate of wages increased in all the other lines of crockery and earthenware after the act of 1883 from 20 to 50 per cent. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman does not deny my statement that the wages in this line of manufacture were reduced after the act of 1883.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I state the facts. I state all the facts.

Mr. McMILLIN. There was a reduction.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have stated just what the reduction was, and just how it was made, and how it was acquiesced in by the workmen.

Mr. McMILLIN. There was a reduction of wages after the passage of the act of 1883. That was my statement, and that statement will never be denied.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, you stated that; but you stated that the reduction came immediately after the increase of duty. The trouble with the gentleman upon the other side is that they state half truths.

Mr. McMILLIN. It came under the act of 1883 while that act was in force. It does not make any difference whether it was immediate or remote.

Mr. BYNUM. It was made during the same year as the passage of the act.

Mr. McMILLIN. And it was made, as I now remember, in the same year, after the passage of the act.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is not the testimony.

Mr. McMILLIN. It is the fact, whether it is the testimony or not.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, can not we have a vote upon this paragraph now?

Mr. MILLS. I want to ask the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] a question which he ought to be able to answer. I want to ask him whether there was a reduction of the wages of workmen in Trenton in this industry after the passage of the tariff act of 1883?

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I will say to the gentleman that I can not tell him that in specific terms. The most of our people are paid by the piece, and there was a difficulty about the sizes as well as rates, and I am not informed as to the terms of settlement nor as to the merits of the controversy as to the sizes, the men claiming that the new sizes entailed more work and the proprietors claiming that they did not.

For this reason I am not able to give him the information specifically, but I have always understood the claim of the men to be that there was a reduction. I can tell him, however, that under the act of 1883 the duty on coverings was removed and the rate on goods was increased, but it was held at the Treasury Department that that part of the act which took away the duty on coverings went into effect some months before the other portion of it which made the increase of duties, and the result was that during that period we had an extra two millions and odd of foreign-made goods poured in upon us, and some of our factories stopped and some of them went on half time because of that circumstance.

Mr. MILLS. I just wanted to get at the fact as to the reduction. My friend from Wisconsin stated—

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. And I will tell the gentleman another thing, that under the act of 1883, when there was a difference of opinion between the proprietors and the men as to the amount of wages, the proprietors offered the men the English wage with the duty added, and they refused to take it. I have the correspondence at my home. But as to the feeling between the employer and the employes in my city, I will say that I have in my hands a fair illustration, copied from the Potter's Journal, the official paper of the workmen in my city, which I will have put in the RECORD. Has the gentleman got all the information he desires?

The extract from the Potter's Journal is as follows:

AN ENJOYABLE EVENT—PRESIDENT BURGESS GIVES A FAREWELL SOCIABLE TO HIS POTTERY EMPLOYEES—THE ADDRESS OF SECRETARY NICHOLS.

A very pleasant event took place last week at the works of the International Pottery Company, occasioned by the giving by the Hon. William Burgess, the president, of a farewell sociable to the employes of the company previous to

his departure for England. The affair was a very enjoyable one throughout and, just as the dancing was about to commence, the employes surprised Mr. Burgess with a handsome set of engrossed resolutions. The presentation was made in a neat speech by the secretary, Mr. I. H. Nichols, and was a complete surprise, and was feelingly accepted by Mr. Burgess in a few appropriate words. Mr. J. A. Campbell was then called upon and made a few witty remarks. A collation was served, which, with dancing, brought a very enjoyable and long to be remembered event to a close.

Secretary Nichols's speech of presentation was as follows:

"Hon. William Burgess and employes of the International Pottery Company, the committee on resolutions requested me to make a few remarks to Mr. Burgess upon this occasion, but before doing so I would like to say a few words to the employes of the company. Quite a number present have been in the employ of the International Pottery Company steadily since it came into the hands of its present owners, but the greater number of you have not been in its employ for so long a time, and for the information of these I will, with your kind permission, give a brief history of this pottery since 1879, when its present officers assumed control of its management, and to show what has been done for it and you under the able direction and supervision of its president, Mr. William Burgess, assisted by Mr. J. A. Campbell, the treasurer of the company.

"Some ten years and a half ago two gentlemen from New York, then engaged in the importing and jobbing of earthenware, sought a new outlet for their enterprise, and, believing that the manufacture of pottery ware in America was destined in time to drive out or stop the importation of foreign ware, visited Trenton, then known as 'the Staffordshire of America,' and being favorably impressed with its location and convenience for the business, and finding the International Pottery Company, then recently incorporated and equipped for business in a convenient and central location, purchased the property. It was an old pottery with but four kilns, with new, young, and inexperienced men at the business, but they were possessed of capital, brains, energy, and grit, and at the start proposed to learn the business and shove the old plant to the front rank of American potteries.

"How well this has been accomplished the new, handsome, and commodious buildings, kilns, and improved machinery, steam heating and drying will bear witness, without words of mine. With this increase in size of plant more workmen have been found places for. In 1879-'80, the first year of its existence, less than 100 persons, male and female, were employed. In the year 1889, the number reached 225, with a pay-roll the first year of \$23,000 to the sum of \$80,000 in the year 1889—this amount exclusive of the counting-room—making a grand total of \$713,000 paid to its operatives and others employed upon the works.

"It also has shown rapid strides in the general excellence of its white and decorated wares, introduced by the restless energy of its officers into every State and Territory of this great Republic. And now, to add a further crown of glory to the old international, to which we all do feel attached, its honored and worthy president has been selected by our Government, by request of the pottery industry of this country, to represent this glorious union of States in the great Staffordshire district of Great Britain, there to still further serve this and all other American potteries, by looking after the importation of English wares, where his ability, knowledge of the business, and sterling integrity will enable him in his position as consul of the United States to see that all goods sent to this country are correctly invoiced, so that the duties levied by this Government will be properly collected.

"It is, therefore, Mr. Burgess, my pleasure, and the pleasure of all the employes of this company, upon the eve of your departure from us for a time, to present you this handsomely engrossed copy of a set of resolutions adopted in this pottery, as an expression of the kindly feeling we all have towards you, an appreciation of your sterling worth, honorable dealings, and of the kind and courteous treatment all have received at your hands while an employer and officer over us. And while we regret that the acceptance of the position conferred by our Government will place the Atlantic Ocean between us, and prevent your active participation in the duties of your office here, we trust that this testimonial will in your absence keep green in your heart the kindly wishes and good feeling we all have towards you, and we desire you to feel in your absence, so far as it lies in our power, we will use every effort to have the affairs of this pottery in as good shape and condition upon your return as you now leave it.

"We therefore wish you, your estimable wife, and interesting children God-speed upon your voyage and improved health in your new home. And when, in the providence of the Almighty, you are permitted to return to the land of your birth and family associations, you may be better Americans, if it be possible, from your residence abroad. We all hope to live to welcome you back with far more pleasure than it is possible to express as we bid you good-by."

The committee on resolutions was as follows: I. H. Nichols, secretary; John W. Wigley, chairman; I. W. Nichols, jr., treasurer; I. H. Nichols, Edmund Davis, Daniel Meleff, H. P. Coulter, I. W. Nichols, jr., J. W. Wigley, Thomas Connel.

The resolutions set forth that the employes desired to express in a suitable manner their appreciation of the business capacity and general worth of their president, Hon. William Burgess, and spoke in feeling terms of the harmonious relations that had always existed between them. The engrossing of these resolutions is something elaborate and unique. The lettering is done in a multitude of varied forms; symbolic and heraldic designs are abundant; view of the pottery appears, and in the center is a likeness of Consul Burgess. The engrossing was done at Professor Rider's Trenton Business College, and is universally admired.

Mr. MILLS. My friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] stated that there was no reduction at all after the passage of the tariff act of 1883.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, no. The gentleman misunderstood me. I stated that there was a reduction in 1885, and I stated how it was made, and if the gentleman will permit me I will read five or six lines from the testimony of ex-Congressman Brewer, whose word, I think, will not be doubted by any gentleman who knows him. Referring to a question previously asked of another witness by Mr. CARLISLE, I read from Mr. Brewer's testimony.

The question was asked as to the reduction of wages in 1885. There was a slight reduction on a small line of goods. The men conceded a reduction of 5 per cent. They did it voluntarily. In fact we left the whole matter to Powderly. In all the other lines there has been in the past five years an increase in wages of 20 to 50 per cent., and many of the men are making more wages than they did previous to 1883. Every time a new shape was brought out we have conceded an advance. Sometimes we have conceded an advance as high as 100 per cent.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. Then what is the necessity of increasing the rates if you can increase wages so rapidly under the existing law?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Because, I will say to my friend, the importations coming in warrant it. Take the line of plain white ware referred to by my friend from Minnesota [Mr. DUNNELL] a moment ago. In

the last three years we have imported nearly \$3,000,000 worth of plain white ware, which means that we have imported nearly \$3,000,000 worth of labor into this country at foreign rates of wages.

[Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana, withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. McMILLIN, there were—ayes 44, noes 67.

Mr. McMILLIN. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. McMILLIN and Mr. MCKINLEY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 50, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move to amend by striking out "55" in line 13 and inserting "50," so as to make the duty 50 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered the gentleman from Ohio has admitted that the bill which has been sent to the Senate increases the rate of duty 4 or 5 per cent. He also made the point that the paragraph to which I offered my previous amendment covered the finer grade of goods, goods not in general use. This paragraph relates to the ordinary grades; and while the reduction proposed by my amendment is not that which should be made nor that to which the users of these goods are entitled, I have offered the amendment in order to determine whether the gentleman from Ohio has resolved, and is going to carry out that resolution, that there shall be an increase of this rate, although according to the schedules which have been sent forth to the country there is to be no increase. This amendment proposes simply the amount of duty which will be paid under the bill already sent to the Senate. I am trying to prevent any increase of taxation on this class of goods which are in general use.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio states that the increase on this class of goods, according to the best estimate which can be made, will be about 5 per cent. In the report of the Tariff Commission of 1882, volume 1, page 760, is a table furnished to that commission by Mr. Wright, of Philadelphia, showing upon actual shipments the exact amount of the increased cost of wares by reason of packages, inland freight, insurance, interest, etc. Of course on the higher class of goods, the very expensive goods, the decorated china and the finest qualities of plain earthenware, which approach in cost, I believe, the decorated china, the increased duty amounts to very little.

But those are not the wares which are used by the common people. On the cheaper classes of ware the cost of packages, the cost of freight, the cost of straw is just the same; so that, while upon one quality of ware the increased duty might be only 5 per cent., upon the other quality of ware it may run up to 50 per cent., the difference arising from difference of valuation. Therefore, when I stated that the increase was from 10 to 50 per cent. my statement included the different grades. On the finer and more expensive qualities of ware the increase would probably not be over 5 to 10 per cent.; but on common grades of ware the duties on packages and inland freight amount to more than the cost of the ware. Consequently, the restoration of this duty will amount to a discrimination against the poor man. It is the very same character of discrimination which runs all through this bill and through every tariff bill that has been framed and passed by the other side of the House. It is a discrimination against the lower grades of goods, not only in earthenware, but in woolen goods, in cotton goods, in everything.

Why is it? Because the great body of the consumers are the masses of the people. They consume the common grades of goods; and the burden of taxation and the profit of the manufacturer is therefore laid upon them, while the consumers of the finer qualities of goods are scarcely touched by any of these bills.

Here is the table to which I have referred:

A.—Calculations on one hundred crates earthenware, being a fair average of the goods as imported.

[Same assortment as on B.]

	Amount.	Per cent.
If bought in 1882 under a 40 per cent. tariff they net the foreign manufacturer.....	\$3,019	
Geographical protection:		
Packages, straw, packing, iron bands, etc.....	\$397	13
Inland freight, shipping charges, etc.....	204	6 7/8
Marine insurance, consul's certificate, etc.....	54	1 7/8
Interest, say thirty days, on \$3,600, at 6 per cent.....	18	
Marine freight, 5,500 feet, at 10s. and 10 per cent.....	362	12
	1,035	34
Tariff protection:		
Total cost of goods on shipboard.....	3,671	
Commission, 2 1/2 per cent.....	92	
	3,763	
Duty, 40 per cent.....	1,505	50
Customs fees, entry, oaths, and brokers, 30 cents per package.....	30	1
	1,535	51
Total cost and protection at seaboard.....	5,589	85

The inland manufacturers are still further protected by railroad freight and breakage. The gross price-list has been advanced and the discount reduced since the tariff was 24 per cent.

B.—One hundred crates same goods.

[Same assortment, etc., as on A.]

If bought in 1857 to 1881, under a 24 per cent. tariff, they would have netted the foreign manufacturer.....	\$2,534
Geographical protection:	
Packages, straw packing.....	\$259
Inland freight, shipping charges, etc.....	156
Marine insurance, certificates, etc.....	60
Interest, ninety days, on \$3,000.....	45
Ocean freight, by sail, 5,500, at 7s. and 5 per cent.....	243
	763
Tariff protection:	
Total cost of goods on ship.....	2,940
Commission, 2 1/2 per cent.....	73
	3,022
Duty 24 per cent.....	725
Customs fees, entry, oaths, and broker's fees, 30 cents per package.....	30
	755

Total cost under 24 per cent. tariff at seaboard 4,032

C.—Calculation showing what would be duty paid and protection afforded under proposed tariff.

	Amount.	Per cent.
Cost of goods at foreign market.....	\$3,019	
Geographical protection:		
Packages, straw, etc.....	\$397	13
Inland freight, etc.....	204	6 7/8
Marine insurance, certificates, etc.....	54	1 7/8
Interest, thirty days, on \$3,600, at 6 per cent.....	18	
Marine freight, 5,500 feet, at 10s. and 10 per cent.....	362	12
	1,035	34
Tariff protection:		
Cost of goods.....	3,019	
Proposed duty, 30 per cent.....	906	30
Customs fees, oaths, etc.....	30	1
	936	31
Total cost and protection.....	4,990	65

Under 24 per cent. tariff, foreign manufacturers netted \$2,534. To-day, under present tariff, they would cost here, duty paid, \$5,589, being an advance of, say, 116 per cent.

Under present tariff they would cost, say, \$4,990, being an advance of 96 per cent.

You may run all through the different grades of wares and you will find that the excessive taxation which will be restored upon the common grades of goods by the administrative bill now pending will amount to from 30 to 80 per cent., not 5 per cent.

Mr. SHIVELY. The lower the price the higher the duty.

Mr. BYNUM. The lower the price the higher, of course, is the percentage of duty.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. McMILLIN, it was rejected.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I move, in line 21, to strike out "sixty" and insert "fifty."

I should like to see even a greater reduction, Mr. Chairman, in this kind of ware, not because it is used more generally by the masses of the people alone, but because of the fact that it seems to me the time has now come when we may expect in the legislation of this country some relief from these heavy burdens of taxation. And for good and sufficient reasons it seems to me that we might indulge in this expectation. We might have expected, for instance, that the Committee on Ways and Means would find some satisfactory reason to reduce the tax on wares of this kind, at least, if they had gone no further. But instead of that they have increased them already virtually in the administrative bill by quite a large percentage.

But the reason to which I wish to call attention specially now, and which seems a sufficient reason to ask a reduction, is because of the fact that the raw material of which this class of goods is made has been reduced since 1883 about 50 per cent. The clay of which it is made is found in this country in inexhaustible quantities. It is found in several States of the Union; and there is in this hearing before the Ways and Means Committee the amplest kind of evidence sufficient and strong enough to convince any reasonable person that the clays of Missouri are of a superior quality to those imported from abroad.

On page 1324 of these hearings, I find in the statement of Mr. Kimes, to which I referred a few moments ago—and who was interested particularly before the committee in endeavoring to get an increase upon his clay of \$2 per ton—I find this statement. First let me say there appears a table which is given showing the prices of this clay from the years 1880 to 1889. Then this summary is given by Mr. Kimes:

During the above period the price of American wrought or washed china clay has receded from an average of \$14 per ton in 1883 to an average of \$10 per ton in 1889.

This, Mr. Chairman, was when he was laboring for an increased duty

of \$2 per ton, as I have said; but following this I find he says that the imported clay which cost the manufacturers \$9.56 a ton in 1883 was produced by them last year at \$5.16. You see the general average is a reduction of more than 50 per cent. on the price of the raw material.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Can the gentleman state what is the cost of the finished product of this industry as compared with the raw material which enters into it?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not know that I could state the percentage.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But is not the cost of the raw material a very slight percentage of the total cost?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not know that it is a "slight percentage." I know that it is quite an item.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But do you think that it is much more than 1 or 2 per cent.?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I have no doubt it is over 20 per cent.

Mr. ADAMS. On page 455 of the Hearings before the committee, the gentleman will find that 90 per cent. is given as the cost of labor.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That is including the cost of the labor of getting out this clay?

Mr. ADAMS. If the gentleman will look on that page he will find what I mean.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I know what you mean; but that 90 per cent. must include the entire labor, getting out the raw material, refining it, preparing it, etc. But the labor cost of getting out the raw material is shown by Mr. Kimes to be about \$4 per ton.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman know that \$12 worth of clay will make \$500 worth of fine ware?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No, sir, I do not know anything of the kind. Besides, I am talking of common stoneware, earthen and crockery ware.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Then you had better be advised of the fact before you undertake to settle this question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Does the gentleman from Ohio object to learning that, if it is a fact?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No, sir, I do not object to learning it; but I do object to taking everything as a fact which is put forward by gentlemen who are interested in this special industry without more satisfactory proof.

Mr. SHIVELY. Do you think it is necessary to know all about the pottery business to be a statesman?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not think it is necessary to know all about it to be able to appreciate the fact that it can be reduced 10 per cent. without injury to the industry itself, and that such a reduction will be a great benefit to the great masses of the people.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GEAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words on this point. I investigated the question of the cost of this material somewhat myself, and I find that the cost of this clay varies from \$12 to \$21 a ton, according to the quality. I find that while we have had a protective tariff on these goods, practically a high tariff according to the rate of 60 per cent., yet the price of the ware has been steadily going down and down in the markets of this country. I happen to have a bill at hand now which was purchased thirty years ago, embracing a lot of this character of ware, the aggregate cost of which is \$310, and I can duplicate the same ware now for \$225, being a reduction of 29 per cent. to the consumer.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Is it not true that prices have gone down in free-trade countries and in all the countries of the world in fact, just as well as the United States?

Mr. GEAR. No; not in this particular instance.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. How can the manufacturer of foreign pottery compete with us?

Mr. GEAR. The establishment of this industry has caused the English and German potters to decline their prices, and as a consequence the American consumer gets the benefit.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Is this the only market that the German and the English producers of pottery have?

Mr. GEAR. Not the only market, but the best market.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And the largest market.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. It is neither the largest nor the best.

Mr. GEAR. I find that in a large percentage of the ware made in New England and New Jersey and Ohio the rates to the consumer are far lower than they formerly were.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That is true of all other imported articles in this country.

Mr. GEAR. We find the American home market, and that while this bill in presenting the present law is mostly for a corrective purpose, it is for the purpose of obtaining the additional benefit of this market to the extent of \$6,000,000 a year on goods imported into this country to-day. That is a very desirable thing, not only in the interest of the manufacturer, but more in the interest of the labor of this country on an article which has to be handled from thirty-five to one hundred and thirty-five times before it is packed and turned over to the merchant for sale to the consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we can give too much emphasis to the fact that this is not for the maintenance of the present rates of duty on the pottery schedule, but that in connection with the administrative bill already passed it is an increase upon rates which are now so high that the gentleman from Ohio, in opening this debate, was pleased to say that the home manufacturers have advanced from commanding 40 per cent. to 60 per cent. of the home market, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] tells us that in the last few years the increase in the wages of labor was from 20 to 25 per cent.

Now, sir, I think that is a rate of progress which ought to be satisfactory to the manufacturer of pottery, and I doubt not to the workmen in the potteries. What possible excuse can there be for imposing an additional tax on the consumers of this common convenience of life. There can be but one object in view, and that is the object stated by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY], and that is to give to the American manufacturer absolute control of the American market.

Now, sir, Senator SHERMAN, in 1883, in defense of the protective policy, said:

The measure of protection should extend so far as to create competition, not to create home monopoly.

You have a measure that extends to the creation of competition. You have an advantage which enables you to make 20 per cent. advance on the home market in seven years. You have an advantage that has enabled you to raise the wages of the laborer from 20 to 25 per cent. on your own statement, and you make a demand for increased advantages to give you entire control of the market. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In other words, you are preparing the way for the formation of that pottery trust with which we were menaced a few months ago, and when you have control of the home market you will have your pottery trust formed.

But, Mr. Chairman, the greatest wrong to the consumers of pottery in this country, the greatest wrong to the people of this country generally, is not in the mere advance of 5 or 10 per cent. that you are imposing upon them, but in the steady, resistless sweep of your tariff bill in shutting them out from their foreign markets. The gentleman from Ohio made a great deal in his speech the other day of the duties shutting out \$25,000,000 of Canadian farm products.

If he examined the report he would find that we are selling to the Canadians just as many farm products as we are buying from them, but when he raises the duties so as to shut out the Canadian farm products he will shut in the products that we are selling to them, and the statistics of our own Treasury Department show that, so far as the balance of trade is concerned, about which we hear so much wild talk in this debate, it was fifteen millions to our advantage in the trade with the Dominion of Canada last year.

Now, sir, I say under these circumstances there is no possible excuse for these increases except the insatiate greed of parties that once get a taste of Treasury pap to get more at every possible opportunity. [Applause on the Democratic side and cries of "Read!" "Read!"]

The question was put on the amendment; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 47, noes 83.

Mr. BYNUM. I move to strike out "fifty-five" and insert "forty-five" in line 23 of the paragraph, and desire to be heard upon that.

This question, I have stated, was fully investigated by the Tariff Commission in 1883, and a number of manufacturers and wholesale men came and presented all the facts in order to give the commission the information that was necessary to frame the bill covering this class of ware. Mr. Thomas C. Smith, of Greenpoint, N. Y., a manufacturer of porcelain, appeared before the commission, and here is what he said in regard to the duty upon china:

The present duty of 45 per cent. on white china should not be altered, as it is preferable to have a low and permanent rate of duty than a temporary high rate of duty with the certain prospect of a lowering of that high rate of duty in a few years and again agitating this question. This present rate, with the full intent of the law properly executed as regards the classification of goods, and goods honestly invoiced, is sufficient to enable the manufacturer in this country to compete with imported goods by the further application of machinery and a constant effort to lessen the cost of production.

Then he goes on to make an argument in favor of the protection of the wage-workers. Now, Mr. Chairman, when a manufacturer appears before a committee or a commission and states that 45 per cent. upon the common grades of china is ample duty, and that it is better to have a regular, permanent rate of duty than to have a fluctuating one, and when he goes further and states that on the higher grades of china 60 per cent. duty is ample, I would like to know why it is that, according to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY], this duty has been or will be increased 5 per cent. without a request on the part of the manufacturers and without the labor of the country having been heard to protest against it.

On the subject of labor, Mr. Chairman, the figures that have been given here are the figures taken during the war or just after its close, when wages in Europe were upon a gold basis and wages in this country

were upon our currency basis. When gentlemen say there is a difference of 100 per cent. or 115 per cent. between our wages and European wages, that statement does not convey an intelligent or correct idea of the advantages and disadvantages that exist in the one case and in the other. Wherever the duty is fixed by law so as to exceed the entire cost of the labor, it makes no difference whether our wages are a thousand or five thousand per cent. more than European wages. When you give to the manufacturers 60 per cent. of protection and the labor cost of the production of his article is only 40 per cent., you have paid him for the entire amount of his labor and 20 per cent. more than the entire amount, and in such a case it is not necessary to stop to compare the rates of wages prevailing in this and in other countries.

So in this schedule they have given the American manufacturer more than the entire labor cost of his product, and if you will go to these great corporations that are engaged in this business you will find them, as I am informed, like the insurance companies, with a president of each company at a salary of from \$7,000 to \$10,000 a year, while the laborers are struggling in the mill for \$1, \$1.25, or \$2 a day; you will find each company with a secretary at a salary of from \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year; you will find each company with a treasurer at an enormous salary, and you will find, as I have been told, that these industries which have started within the last few years have already paid back more than ten times over the entire capital invested in them at the beginning.

The amendment was rejected—ayes 50, noes 62.

Mr. BYNUM. I move to insert as an additional section following 105 and before we proceed to 106, the paragraph which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

White granite, common ware, plain, white, or cream-colored, lustered or printed under glaze, in a single color, sponged, dipped, or edged ware, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. BYNUM. I offer that amendment, because the classification takes these articles out of the two preceding classifications, which cover the decorated china and the plain chinaware at these enormously high rates of duty. Certainly there ought to be another grade in this schedule. These cheap, common wares are found in the household of every workingman in the country, and there are consumed in the United States of this grade of goods three times the amount that are consumed of tin-plate. The enormous consumption of the common grades of earthenware makes it necessary, I think, that we should have another classification in order that these cheap wares shall come in at a lower rate of duty than either plain or decorated china. I submit this schedule, therefore, in good faith, and I believe it ought to be adopted in justice to the people of the country, while at the same time it will do entire justice to the manufacturers.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to strike out the last word of the amendment. The honorable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] has stated that the object of these increased duties is not to benefit the manufacturer, but to benefit the workingman. It has been shown by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] that the wages paid in this class of business amounts to only 41 per cent. of the cost of manufacture. Therefore, if this rate of duty is intended for the benefit of the workingman, I hope our friends will not insist upon a greater rate of taxes upon this article than is required by the wages paid to labor, especially upon the class of articles referred to by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], articles which are used by the masses of the people.

Reference has been made to the great amount of wages paid to labor in this industry. If gentlemen will look at the census of 1880, they will find that the whole amount of wages paid in the stoneware, glassware, and earthenware industries was \$3,279,000. The total number of persons engaged in these industries was 8,449, which shows that the average annual wages of the employes in this industry are only \$387, or \$32.25 per month. That is the average rate of wages that the men get who are engaged in making this class of goods.

Mr. BURROWS. Does the gentleman know what was paid in wages in the pottery industry alone in 1889?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not. No doubt it was much greater, but it will probably show the same relatively low rate of wages.

Mr. BURROWS. Six and a quarter million dollars were paid in wages in that industry last year.

Mr. SPRINGER. That goes to show that in the last nine years the industry has increased 100 per cent. in the amount of wages paid and in the amount of the output. Therefore, we have here an industry that seems to be prospering; yet gentlemen come in and insist upon largely increasing the protection which the tariff now gives and has given during the past nine years. I desire to call attention to the fact that this proposed increase of duties is not for the benefit of the workingman.

Gentlemen have stated that it was to enable our manufacturers to pay high wages; that we paid higher wages in this country than are paid in any other, and that our manufacturers are enabled to pay these high wages by reason of the protection upon articles they manufacture. I desire to call attention to the fact that in Germany—a protection country—only one-half the rate of wages is paid in this class of business that is paid in England, where all these goods are made on a free-

trade basis, and without any protection whatever; so that if it is protection that increases the wages in this country, what is it that makes wages less in Germany than in England?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURROWS. I merely wish to present, to be printed in the RECORD, a statement of the president of the Wheeling Pottery Company showing the progress and development of the pottery industry, the importations, the rate of wages, etc.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let it be read now from the Clerk's desk.

Mr. BURROWS. It would take too long. The gentleman can see it in the morning.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will look at it now, and will hand it to the Reporter.

The statement submitted by Mr. BURROWS is as follows:

STATISTICS ON POTTERY INDUSTRY.

To write the early history of the pottery industry of the United States would be to record many failures and few successes.

The business only became a practical and commercial success about 1863, and many have been the obstacles since that date that the successful potter has had to surmount, no other manufacturing business requiring the technical and artistic knowledge and watchful care in its innumerable and delicate processes like that of the potter. Therefore it should have the highest rate of protection accorded the most favored industry. The following table will indicate its growth in the United States:

TABLE A.

Items.	1860.	1873.	1882.	1889.
Number of potteries in United States	1	20	55	80
Number of large-ware kilns or ovens	2	68	244	401
Number of decorating kilns or potteries	None.	None.	26	188
Capital invested	None.	\$1,020,000.00	\$5,076,000.00	\$10,597,857
Value of product	None.	\$1,180,000.00	\$5,299,140.00	\$10,389,910
Amount paid for wages on pottery	None.	None.	\$2,387,000.00	\$6,263,224
Number of employes engaged	None.	None.	7,000	16,900
Proportion of men employed	None.	None.	60 per cent.	50 per cent.
Proportion of women and girls	None.	None.	20 per cent.	30 per cent.
Proportion of boys	None.	None.	20 per cent.	20 per cent.
Per cent. of wages to sales	None.	None.	45 per cent.	60 per cent.
Per cent. of decorated wares sold	None.	None.	None.	50 per cent.
Per cent. of white wares sold	None.	None.	None.	50 per cent.

The above estimates for 1889 were made by taking last year's business of the Wheeling pottery, which has been in operation since 1880 (our New La Belle work not being in full operation). Our product consists of adamantine china and white granite ware, decorated and plain white. This factory has seven large kilns and five decorating kilns, and I believe is a fair standard to estimate the product of the entire factories of the United States by.

Capital invested	\$185,000
Net sales	\$181,370
Wages paid	\$109,333
Number of employes, men, women, boys, and girls	295
Average weekly earnings, men, women, boys, and girls	\$8.05

(Estimating forty-six weeks in a year.)

The estimates for 1882 are taken from Tariff Commission reports, page 613, J. H. Brewer's testimony.

We find the percentage of wages to value of product has advanced from 45 per cent. in 1882 to 60 per cent. in 1889. This is not owing to an advance in wages, but is due to reduction in the selling price of the product and large increase in the sales of decorated ware, in which labor enters in much greater proportion to materials. This also explains the increased number of females employed, who find appropriate and desirable employment for their sex.

Below we present a table of imports from 1874 to 1879, which was carefully compiled by Mr. Loren Blodgett:

TABLE B.

We imported during the fiscal year—	Decorated or ornamental ware worth—	While the total amount of our importation of earthenware was—
1874-'75	\$654,965	\$4,441,216
1875-'76	718,166	4,212,955
1876-'77	668,513	3,772,124
1877-'78	637,485	3,996,737
1878-'79	813,850	4,178,038
1879-'80	1,188,147	5,760,163
1880-'81	1,626,112	6,726,254
1881-'82	2,075,707	7,128,668
1882-'83	2,587,545	8,864,062
1883-'84	2,771,864	4,954,813
1884-'85	2,828,358	4,857,728
1885-'86	2,927,161	4,947,621
1886-'87	3,622,107	5,716,927
1887-'88	4,133,884	6,410,871
1888-'89	4,247,001	6,476,199

By taking the imports for 1888-'89, as shown by this table \$6,476,199 and adding thereto the amount of duty paid thereon, namely: \$4,247,001 (decorated) at 60 per cent. 2,548,200 \$2,229,198 (white) at 55 per cent. 1,228,068

Total amount of imports with duty added 10,250,467

We will now endeavor to discover what was paid by the foreign manufacturer for labor in producing this amount of goods. The only official tables we have at hand are by Consul Schoenhof, who writes under date of February 18, 1886, from Tunstall, England, page 75, wherein he states that wages are 47 per cent. of the selling price of goods in Staffordshire potteries, which figures we will use, although we know this estimate is too high:

Value of imports in 1889 (i. e., selling price in England)	\$6,476,199
47 per cent. being for labor, shows the amount of wages to be.....	3,076,194
To which we will add the whole tariff paid to the United States as above, in Table B.....	3,774,258

Total paid for wages in England and duties to United States..... 6,850,452

We refer to Table A, where it will be found the sales of American wares for 1889 were \$10,889,910, being practically the same as the foreign imports with the duty added thereto. To make this \$10,889,910 there was paid to the American operators on the potteries for wages \$6,263,224, leaving only \$587,223 to partially make good the great difference in cost of materials, such as china clays, bearing a duty of 60 per cent.; boracic acid, 100 per cent., and other articles too numerous to mention, extra cost of plant, etc. We believe in protecting for their fullest development in our own country all the materials used in our manufacture, and we further believe that the tariff should be higher on our highly finished product than upon the material of which it is composed.

This additional fact should not be lost sight of, that these comparisons (of wages) have been made with our old competitors, the English manufacturers, who pay approximately 83 per cent. more wages than the French and 50 per cent. more than the German or Austrian, our present most aggressive rivals. These countries formerly were not considered in our estimate of probable competition, but are now furnishing about one-half of the total imports.

It appears that Austria, which sent nothing previous to 1879, now sends nearly \$500,000 yearly of decorated goods; Germany, \$600,000; France, \$900,000; England, \$2,000,000; Japan, \$175,000. This new exigency confronts us and should be carefully considered and given due weight by our legislators in fixing a safe rate of duties.

The extraordinary development of pottery manufacture in this country, and the consequent competition with wares of foreign make since 1863, has reduced the cost of plain white wares to the American consumer, as shown by the Tariff Commission report, page 627 to 631, from 1852 to 1882 as follows:

1852. Assorted crate of ware was sold for.....	\$95.30
1864. Same assorted crate of ware was sold for.....	210.75
1872. Same assorted crate of ware was sold for.....	143.08
1875. Same assorted crate of ware was sold for.....	129.61
1877. Same assorted crate of ware was sold for.....	110.10
1882. Same assorted crate of ware was sold for.....	57.89
1890. Same assorted crate of ware is now sold for.....	46.30

Decorated wares are so various in design, owing to rapidly changing fashion, that it is almost impossible to find parallel cases for comparison. We believe, however, that no one will doubt the assertion that the selling prices were from 50 to 100 per cent. higher in 1882 than they are now in 1890. A surprising lesson upon protection seems to be presented by the above table of prices. In 1852, with a 24 per cent. revenue tariff and no domestic manufactures, an assorted crate of white wares sold at \$95.30. In 1890, with a 55 per cent. tariff and domestic competition, the same assorted crate of white ware is selling for \$46.30. Respectfully submitted.

HOMER LAUGHLIN.

E. M. PEARSON,

President of the Wheeling Pottery Company, Wheeling, W. Va.
WASHINGTON, D. C., April 14, 1890.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, as I stated some time ago, I make my protest against this china and glass schedule at the request and solicitation of constituents who are engaged in the business of importing and selling this line of goods. Their trade and prosperity depend entirely on the ability of the laboring men to pay the prices asked. Nearly all the arguments that have been made in support of this bill have been based on the idea that it protects the American manufacturer and suppresses, or, to use a favorite expression on the other side, "checks" trade. I maintain that the importer and business man has some rights which Congress should respect. He ought not to be legislated out of existence.

If he is crushed, what is to become of his clerks, his draymen, his porters, and not only all of his immediate employes, but of all the men who work at loading and unloading vessels, and who in one way or another are engaged in transporting the merchandise in which he trades? Are not these workingmen, whose wages and whose existence should be protected, or at least regarded, by any just tariff law? Sir, this bill is the culmination of the protection theory. It is its application to the point of absolute absurdity. It manifestly imposes duties no longer to prevent injurious competition, but it imposes duties to prohibit and destroy importation. It uses the taxing power no longer with any guise or pretense of raising revenue, but on the contrary throws off the mask and raises tariff taxes so high as to reduce surplus revenue by stopping imports.

In other words, instead of being a tariff for revenue with incidental protection, it is a tariff for protection with incidental, and I might well say accidental, revenue. Sir, when we get the duties so high that no products can come from abroad, what is the logical and only result? Why, it follows that the foreign laborer, being unable to sell his product, must and will come here to sell his labor in the open, unprotected labor market in direct competition with those, native and foreign-born, who are already here. This will not alarm the protected manufacturer. Oh, no; it will be new grist come to his mill!

Having the home market under his control he will reap higher profits. The greater the competition between laborers for work, the greater the number of laborers clamoring for the job, the lower the wages. No protected manufacturer, no matter how earnestly he may plead for protection to the wage-earner on the floor of Congress, was ever yet known to bid against himself in the labor market and pay \$1.25 per day when he could hire a man to do the same work for \$1 per day.

Pass this bill, gentlemen, and it will not be long before you will have to face the problem of suppression of immigration. You cry out now "check imports;" are you ready to cry out "check immigration?" Dare you assume the rôle of the Know-Nothing party of old?

Yet "check imports" and you can not escape, dodge it as you may, its natural consequence, the stoppage of free immigration.

Alas! to what desperate straits has "the grand old party of lofty moral ideas" been driven, when, at the demand of the cormorants who now dominate it, the Ways and Means Committee report a bill the avowed purpose of which is to prohibit and destroy imports, and therefore to annihilate the little foreign trade which is left us, and almost on the same day the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries brings in a bill proposing to give 30 cents per ton for every thousand miles sailed by any ship flying the American flag. This is a subsidy; this is a gift absolute and outright from the Treasury, of the people's money, and it is estimated that the sum required would reach six millions of dollars per annum.

Now, sir, if the McKinley bill destroys our foreign trade and the Farquhar subsidy bill becomes a law we will have the strange and heretofore unheard-of spectacle of vessels being paid by the Government 30 cents per ton per thousand miles to sail empty—absolutely empty—save, perhaps, with sand for ballast, from port to port. Well might we pause and ask whither will the blind fetich worship of this protective fallacy lead us?

But, sir, to return to the topic from which I have for the moment strayed. I stated that I spoke voicing the protests of merchants in my Congressional district. I hold in my hand a letter which came to me signed by three of the largest firms in Nashville, Tenn. I will read it:

NASHVILLE, TENN., May 1, 1890.

DEAR SIR: In all our business experience we have not had occasion until recently to call on our member of Congress for anything, but lately it has been necessary for us to write to you and ask your influence on the proposed change in the interstate-commerce law; and once again we have to call on you and urgently request that you may do something to defeat the proposed exorbitant duty on pottery and glassware, as per attached sheet.

Yours truly,

JOHNSON & MURDOCK,
HOUSTON, BRIDGES & CO.,
JOHN DUFF.

Hon. J. E. WASHINGTON,
Washington, D. C.

In that sheet I find they say:

Below you will find a comparison of the effect which the bill before Congress will have on pottery and glassware. If you are in favor of inflicting such impositions upon the consumers of the country, pardon our troubling you with this document. If, however, you think the millions of consumers have any rights which the favored few should respect, give it your attention in Congress, and you can make no mistake as to the feelings of your constituents.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I will print the entire table of duties as sent to me. It is as follows:

Description.	Present duty.	Duty under the administrative bill.	Duty under the administrative and new tariff bill.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
5 to 7 inch opal globes, white.....	45	77	205
5 to 7 inch opal globes, fancy.....	45	47½	72
Student chimneys, common.....	45	77	450
Student chimneys, crystal.....	45	50½	112
7-inch opal shades, common.....	45	74	203
7-inch opal shades, fancy.....	45	48	69
10-inch opal shades, common.....	45	56	135
10-inch opal shades, decorated.....	45	52	81
10-inch opal shades, plated.....	45	47	60
Tumblers, light.....	45	58	75
Tumblers, heavy.....	45	58	115
Tumblers, etched.....	45	56	111
Siphons, plain.....	45	53	182
Siphons, etched.....	45	52	270
Bohemian tumblers, plain.....	45	67	149
Bohemian tumblers, etched.....	45	61	106
Prisms, 3-inch U drops.....	45	53	74
Silver vases.....	45	73½	334
Cold-decorated vases.....	45	65	224
Alabaster vases.....	45	56	170
Fine vases.....	45	56	170
White English earthenware.....	55	66½ to 70	66½ to 70
Decorated English earthenware.....	60	68 to 75	68 to 75
White china, Bohemian.....	59	70	70
Decorated china, Bohemian.....	60	75 to 80	75 to 80
Thuringia china.....	60	75	75
Bisque figures.....	60	71	71
Toy tea-sets.....	35	52	90

Specific duty is calculated on the net weight of goods. Should it be collected on gross weight, respecting which the bill is indefinite, it would vastly increase the rates.

I have cited several of the most flagrant and unnecessary increases which it is proposed in this bill to make on the commonest article of china and glass ware. I find, in going further down the list, the committee has not been satisfied with taxing those things which enter into the consumption of adults and which are the necessaries of life; but it has even extended its remorseless hands so as to gather tribute from

sucklings and babes—yea, from infants and children. This committee proposes actually to increase the tariff on "toy tea-sets," such as are bought at the holy Christmas-tide by fond parents to gladden the hearts of the little girls (God bless them!) in every family.

On the little child's tea-set the duty is to be increased from 35 to 90 per cent., nearly 300 per cent.—an enormous increase—and for whose benefit? Surely not for the happiness of the child. Can it find any greater delight in setting its doll's table with a tea-set taxed 300 per cent.? Surely not for the father's benefit. If he has scraped and saved for six months to make glad his little daughter's heart with a new china toy tea-set will he be any happier or better when he finds that what he could buy last Christmas for \$1 will cost him \$3 next Christmas, and that for all this and for many other similar blessings he has to thank brother MCKINLEY's tariff bill?

Is it for the benefit of the laborer my good friends on the other side say that they tax the toy tea-sets of the poor laborer's child 90 per cent.? God forefend that the gentlemen on the other side should so harden their hearts in this insatiate greed for money as to turn a deaf ear to the pleadings of the little girls all over this land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why, sir, I find that not content with taxing tea-sets this veritable octopus of a bill has extended its tentacles of taxation even to the child's toys, to dolls of every description. On these the tariff is fixed at 45 per cent., an increase of 10 per cent. over the present rate. Every little bisque china doll's head with curls that gladdens the heart of infants is to be made to pay its part of the tribute to this great greedy giant of monopoly which holds its hand upon the throat of the laborers of this country.

Sir, as Santa Claus is by many considered of foreign birth and by some is thought to have his residence and workshop somewhere among those Germans who are so skillful in devising and constructing dolls and toys of every description, I am astonished that I do not find somewhere in the bill a prohibitory tariff laid on him. Indeed, if they could only catch and hold him long enough, I would be willing to swear they would lay a tax on him, reindeers, sled, and all.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to submit a brief statement in this connection.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Let us vote on this paragraph and the gentleman can make his remarks after the next paragraph has been read.

Mr. DOCKERY. My remarks will dovetail in here perhaps a little more appropriately than they would upon the succeeding paragraph, for the reason that the question of wages of labor has been brought somewhat prominently into the controversy touching the schedule under consideration. This induces me, Mr. Chairman, to review somewhat the increase that has been made in the wages of labor in this country as compared with the products of labor under a protective system.

I find that in 1850 the average wages paid each laborer in our protected industries was \$244, while his products were valued at \$1,063. In 1860 the average wages paid were \$288, while the value of the product was \$1,438. In 1870 the average wage was \$377 and the value of the product \$2,060. In 1880 the average wage paid to each laborer in the protected industries of the United States was \$305, while the value of his product was estimated at \$2,047.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have the result, so far as the wages of labor are concerned, in this and other schedules, that the productive capacity of laborers in protected industries during twenty years of protection has increased from \$1,063 to \$2,047, or 92 per cent., while wages have increased only from \$244 to \$305, or but 23 per cent. The beggarly increase of only 23 per cent. in the wages of labor whilst at the same time there has been 92 per cent. increase in the value of the products of labor!

Again, Mr. Chairman, I desire to emphasize the statement made yesterday by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] as to the nationality of protected labor. Who, then, are the laborers in protected industries? According to the census of 1880 there were then—and I imagine the proportion is much larger now—but at that time of the men employed in protected industries 819,069, or 33 per cent. of the entire number, were foreigners, many of them imported under contract. And these, Mr. Chairman, are the men whom you propose to protect, or rather you propose to protect their employers by advancing the rates of duty on nearly all of these schedules.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected; there being—ayes 50, noes 67.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 23:

"Provided, however, That the rates of duty to be assessed under sections 103, 104, and 105, immediately preceding, shall not include the value of cartons, cases, crates, boxes, sacks, or coverings on any kind, or any other costs, charges, or expenses incident to placing the merchandise in condition packed ready for shipment to the United States.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. The effect of the amendment, Mr.

Chairman, is simply to retain the existing rates on this schedule of articles. We have heard, as I said a few moments ago, that our industries are prospering under the present tariff, and this amendment maintains the *status quo* without changing anything or doing any injustice to anybody. I think, therefore, it ought to be adopted.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to a statement just made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], which I will not controvert, but will accept—I do not know whether it is correct or not, but I will accept it as correct—which statement is that the wages paid in this line of industry in the United States last year amounted to \$6,000,000. Put that with the statement of the chairman of the committee that the product was over \$10,000,000, and you will find that 60 per cent. of the product is wages. In other words, we find that in \$1,000 worth of this ware, according to the calculations of these gentlemen, \$600 would be for wages. In addition to this take the statement of the gentleman from Ohio, which I believe to be incorrect, although I will accept his statement also, that the wages are 100 per cent. higher in this country than they are in the Staffordshire potteries of England.

Mr. MCKINLEY. One hundred and thirteen per cent. is the evidence before the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. And the evidence of the New Jersey labor commission, in its report of 1883, or thereabouts, showed that it was much lower, and the reports of our consul at Burslem put it much lower. But suppose it is 100 per cent. higher here than in the Staffordshire potteries of England. Then in Staffordshire, England, the wages in \$1,000 worth of pottery would be \$300 and in this country it would be \$600.

Now, if you want to compensate the manufacturers according to the idea of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], who claimed that the tariff was only to compensate them for the differences of wages in our own and other countries, you do so by giving them a tariff of 30 per cent. That would be all that is necessary. By 30 per cent. added you equalize the cost of production in the two countries, and when in addition to that is added the cost of transportation, etc., you give the home manufacturer an additional protection. But when you make this 60 per cent., or 55 per cent., which is the general run of this schedule, you are giving him all of the wages he pays and are calling upon the other industries of the country to pay him every cent of wages that he puts into the entire conduct of his business for the manufacture of these articles.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 55, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I offer the amendment I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

In line 21, page 14, strike out the word "sixty" and insert "fifty."

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I think this amendment has already been voted upon, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCKINLEY. What is the amendment proposed by the gentleman?

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. To strike out "sixty" in this paragraph and insert "fifty."

Mr. BAYNE. I make the point of order that this amendment has already been voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that this identical amendment was voted down.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Is it not in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the same having been offered and voted down the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Glass and glassware:

107. Green, and colored, and flint, and lime glass bottles, holding more than one quart, and demijohns, and carboys (covered or uncovered), and other plain, molded, or pressed green, and colored, and flint, and lime glassware, not specially provided for in this act, 1 cent per pound; if holding one pint, and not more than one quart, 1½ cents per pound; if holding less than one pint, and not less than one-quarter of a pint, 1½ cents per pound; if holding less than one-quarter of a pint, 50 cents per gross.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I move to strike out the words "and one-quarter," in line 9, and also strike out the "s" after the word "cent" in the same line; so it will read "1 cent per pound."

Also, in line 11, to strike out the words "and one-half," and also the letter "s" in the word "cents;" so it will read "1 cent per pound." In other words, Mr. Chairman, so there will be no increase of the duty upon the goods mentioned in this paragraph from the present rate as shown by the table before me. I know that the rate of duty is very largely increased by the administrative bill upon these particular items, very largely increased. But there is an objection to this change as it appears in this bill. The objection is that we do not know from this combination of duties, and we are not shown by the committee, what the percentage will be or what the duty will actually amount to. At the bottom of this table is a foot-note as follows:

The amount of duty collected under the present law is inserted here, as there

are no quantities from which the specific duties can be computed. These rates are, however, an increase upon the present as to all flint and lime glass bottles filled with goods not subject to ad valorem rates.

It is also an increase upon all duties, and I have not heard any good reason for this increase. I do not suppose if I were to ask the members of the committee the reason I would receive any satisfactory information. I do not believe a large majority of the members on the other side of the House know what they are doing with regard to this bill. [Laughter.] The members of the Ways and Means Committee may know something about it, but I do not think the members generally understand it. In fact I do not believe there is a member of the Committee of Ways and Means who can give a satisfactory statement on this point, or who can tell within \$10,000,000 of what the result of this bill will be.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is the gentleman positive about himself? [Laughter.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I know I would not be able to find out if I attempted for ten years. But I know also there would be no use in asking the gentleman from Maine for any information in regard to it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. The committee frankly state to the House that so far as the reduction is concerned we think it will amount to between \$50,000,000 and \$60,000,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. But there is nothing said about this particular clause.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Just you hold on one moment. [Laughter.] I turn to the recapitulation and there the committee say, in speaking of the effect of the bill:

The reduction above given of \$71,264,414.41 appears to be certain.

Gentlemen of the committee, that is your own statement as to the reduction, although in that reduction all of the free-list, including sugar, and all of the reduction of internal-revenue tax on tobacco, amounting to about \$10,000,000, is included.

Then you say:

If the imports should be the same as last year, the new rates of reduction would amount to—

You ought to have put the word "only" in—

Thirty million nine hundred and eighty-eight thousand eight hundred and fifty-five dollars and fifty-seven cents.

In other words, here is a plain statement of the increase that this bill proposes. It is intended to increase the tax on the people of this country by the enormous sum of \$40,000,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Does the gentleman believe that the importations will be maintained if this bill shall become a law?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That is what I am estimating it on.

Mr. MCKINLEY. That is a very important question. We could only make our statement upon the basis of last year's importations. We said what the result would be if the importations continued the same. That is all we could say. That is all the gentleman can say. If he will tell us exactly what the importations will be, why then we can tell him the effect it will have upon the revenues.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. You admit that if the importations do continue the same—

Mr. MCKINLEY. Yes.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The increased taxation by virtue of this bill will be \$40,000,000.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Between thirty and forty millions.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes; thirty-nine millions nine hundred and some odd thousands.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Of revenue?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Of tax. Revenue and tax are synonymous terms in this connection. Very well. They object—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I ask to have two minutes that have been taken out by interruptions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will continue for two minutes.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The other proposition is that if the importations should not continue as large, then there will be a proportionate or pro rata reduction. Very well. Your purpose, you say, is to enable the American manufacturer to hold the market. If he holds the market then he will control it. He will hold up the price at the expense of the consumer, and whether or no taxes are levied for the use and benefit of the Government and come into the Treasury, or whether they are to be levied for and go into the pockets of the manufacturers, it does not lighten the burden on the people a particle. Upon certain articles enumerated, by the increase of the duties \$40,000,000 of taxes are levied upon the people of this country by this bill above those levied under the present law. That \$40,000,000 must either go to the Government or to the manufacturer. You may admit that the price is not always the same as if the whole of the duty were added by the beneficiary of a protective duty. I will admit that. But you permit them to do so. You enable them to do so by such legislation. Your bill provides that they may do so for want of competition. You must enable them to do so if there is to be any force and effect in your proposition, that you will keep these taxes up or increase them in order to pay high wages.

Mr. BAYNE. I have only a word to say in respect to this. This is a very large industry in this country, represented in eighteen States of the Union. It gives employment to a great many men, and the importations under existing law are very large, amounting in this paragraph to over \$300,000 during last year. The importations are increasing. In 1800 they were only \$43,000; in 1889 there were over \$300,000 worth of these importations, and they are constantly increasing. The purpose of the committee, as has been agreed upon all along, was not to increase duties anywhere unless those duties were necessary for the protection of an article manufactured in our own country, and they took large importations as an admonition of duty. The committee said, "We will let our people make these articles and shut out importations, and reduce this revenue that is going into the Treasury of the Government."

These were the reasons which influenced the committee. These are the reasons which influence protectionists. They feel that when we have the capacity and ability to make what is necessary for home consumption of any article and furnish it to the consumer at a reasonable price, our people should have an opportunity to make that article for the home consumer, and when they see in the reports of the Treasury Department the fact that large importations of any particular article are coming into the country, as is the case in the paragraph under consideration, they say—that is, the protectionists say—that the duty should be increased in order to enable our people to make these things. Just like my friend from Florida [Mr. BULLOCK], who appeared before the committee and asked for an increase of the duty upon oranges, because there is a large importation of oranges, while Florida grows the best oranges in the world, and they were desirous to give Florida an opportunity to supply them.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BAYNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. I have not examined to see what the total importations of glassware were, but I notice that the imports were nearly a million dollars last year.

Mr. BAYNE. Oh, yes; but that includes a good many other articles, and the importation of glassware ran up to over \$6,000,000—I think that is the amount; but I call my friend's attention to the fact that under this paragraph now under consideration \$300,000 worth was imported last year. In 1880 there was only \$43,000 worth imported, and the importation had increased from year to year, and is getting larger and larger as the years roll on.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Have there been any exportations at all of this class of goods?

Mr. MCKINLEY. There has been no exportation in this class at all.

Mr. BAYNE. There has been no exportation of this class, I believe, unless it should be some that are filled with mineral waters, but only to that extent.

Mr. CANNON. What kind of glassware was exported?

Mr. BAYNE. I am not sure, but I think it was bottles filled with mineral waters.

Mr. MANSUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

We want reduction of the tariff. We are taxed on every interest; blood is not only extracted from the larger veins of the body politic, but it is bound hand and foot and covered all over with gallinippers, who are allowed to suck blood from every vein.

Who said that? General John A. Logan, in the Congressional Globe, April 28, 1870. Again—

Now, when the gentleman, who seems to be the protector in an especial manner of the great labor interests of this country, speaks of this protection being the protection of the labor of this country, I ask him: Does not every farmer and mechanic in this broad land make use of these articles in all kinds of labor? The 4,000,000 men that have been freed recently are laborers, are producers, not manufacturers. They are not men of skilled labor; they evidently are not men who are protected. And then there are the men in the Northwest who produce corn, wheat, oats, pork, and beans, etc.; they are producers and consumers, and they are not protected; and it is they who pay this large amount of money into the pockets of the manufacturers of these articles. And when a gentleman stands upon the floor and tells me that this high, this extraordinarily high, tariff is for the protection of the laboring men I tell him that I do not understand how he can possibly substantiate such a theory.

The only change I have made was to leave out the word "iron" and use the word "articles." Who said that? John A. Logan, in the Congressional Globe of April 13, 1870.

Under the figures given by Mr. President Cleveland there are not to exceed two and a quarter millions of protected men in every way, shape, and manner in the United States. There are at least seven and two-thirds millions of farmers and those who are employed upon the farm and the land. Put it as you will, the great burden of these taxes must rest necessarily upon that class. They are the ones who pay, because, it being a tax upon consumption, they are the ones who must do the eating, the ones who must buy the clothing, the ones who must build the houses for shelter. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt in the minds of those who have examined the question that we are able to produce in this country every particle of these goods that are needed by our people, nor will it be questioned that the labor of this country is as vitally concerned in this schedule as in any other contained

in this bill. In the production of these articles 80 per cent. represents the cost of labor, 60 per cent. of it at the glass factories and 20 per cent. in the preparation of the materials which go into the completion of the finished product. In this connection I desire to have read at the Clerk's desk an opinion expressed by the largest manufacturer in my State.

The Clerk read as follows:

BALTIMORE, May 10, 1890.

DEAR SIR: We write you in regard to the tariff bill on window-glass and bottles, which is now before Congress, and we strongly urge the passage of this bill to the successful continuation of our business. We urge the following reasons:

First. Our industry is natural to this country, there being about one hundred and ninety flint and green bottle-glass furnaces distributed through eighteen States and materials existing in great abundance throughout our Union.

Second. We ask protection because our labor cost is several hundred times greater than of our foreign competitors, all being hand labor, 60 per cent. being paid directly by us at our works and about 20 per cent. in mining, preparing, and transporting our sand, lime, coal, salt, and lumber. These points have been fully shown from consular reports before the Senate Finance and Ways and Means Committees.

Third. The duty asked is only reasonable, less than our increased labor cost would justify and the lowest laid on any class of glass.

In regard to window-glass, the manufacture in this country has greatly increased in latter years, because of the protection given manufacturers in this country, but there is still an enormous quantity of window-glass brought in and sold in competition with the domestic glass at a profit. The rate of wages in this country paid to window-glass blowers, cutters, and shearers is more than treble the wages paid in Europe for the same class of work. The same condition will apply to window-glass as we have stated regarding flint and green bottle ware. We therefore trust you will use all means in your power to have the McKinley bill passed.

With regards, we are, yours, truly,

SWINDELL BROS.

Mr. HENRY STOCKBRIDGE, Jr., Washington, D. C.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, when to the cost of the glass itself, as represented in the wages paid at the factory and the wages paid to the men in the preparation of it, there is added the cost in the preparation of the plant, in the preparation of the retorts, and in the keeping of the retorts and the machinery in order, you swell the total cost of this product from 80 per cent. to 90. or much nearer 95 per cent. Thus, in protecting this industry we are giving to the fullest extent protection to American labor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, protection to American labor is a delightful theme and one that I would like to dwell upon myself. I observe that the letter which has just been read contains a most remarkable statement. Here is an interested witness testifying in his own behalf that the wages paid to labor in this country is "several hundred times times" as great as the wages paid to like labor in Europe. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] A very swift witness in his own behalf.

Mr. PAYNE. That is probably a mistake.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Well, leave out the "hundred" and say "several times," and still the statement is inaccurate and untrue. The wages paid to the glass-men is perhaps higher than the wages paid in any other industry in this country. When the Mills bill was under consideration a gentleman representing the window-glass-blowers or window-glass-makers, a laboring man, came here and visited members of this House, came and saw me, to see if he could not touch my obdurate heart and get me to vote for an increase of the duty upon window-glass, or at least to vote to leave the duty where it then was. He pathetically implored such action on behalf of American labor. Within a year, sir, that gentleman has been brought to the bar of public opinion for importing foreign glass-workers into this country in contravention of the law of the United States against it.

He could import the labor, but at the time I have spoken of he was appealing—and it is the same appeal that comes to us now again—that we should not touch this tax because of the danger that it would reduce the wages of labor. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] gives a better reason, and that is that the importations are increasing. We must strike down importations! We must exclude importations! We must prevent foreign goods of all kinds from coming into this country. We must destroy the commerce of the United States and then give a bounty to ships to go hunting about the ocean to try to recover some of it!

Gentlemen on this floor have cited the fact that the balance of trade has been against us in recent years. If they will take the trouble to look at the statistics of those countries which buy most from us they will find that they are the countries whose importations it is now proposed to shut out. Gentlemen say that we shall not permit these importations to come in, but will keep capital at home so as to employ our own labor. What kind of capital is it that you keep at home? Is it money? Is it bullion? No; it is the products of American labor.

Take Great Britain and Ireland. Last year they bought of this country \$200,000,000 more than they sold to us, and when we buy anything from them we simply place in their markets the products of American labor and draw upon that fund to pay for what we buy.

The amendment was rejected—ayes 51, noes 78.

The Clerk read as follows:

108. All articles enumerated in the preceding paragraph, if filled, and not otherwise provided for in this act, and the contents are subject to an ad valorem rate of duty, or to a rate of duty based upon the value, the value of such bottles, vials, or other vessels shall be added to the value of the contents for the ascertainment of

the dutiable value of the latter; but if filled, and not otherwise provided for in this act, and the contents are not subject to an ad valorem rate of duty, or to a rate of duty based on the value, or are free of duty, such bottles, vials, or other vessels shall pay, in addition to the duty, if any, on their contents, the rates of duty prescribed in the preceding paragraph: *Provided*, That no article manufactured from glass described in the preceding paragraph shall pay a less rate of duty than 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Not being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I do not profess to have gone into a careful examination of the schedules in this bill or to have ascertained by statistics what rate of duty ought to be levied for the purposes of revenue. But, sir, if the fathers of this country, who framed our Constitution providing that Congress, for the purpose of revenue, might lay duties on imports, had had the power now to see what is being done in this House under that provision, it seems to me they would have hesitated long before authorizing such an exercise of power. I do not mean to say that, properly exercised, it would not be a beneficent power; but, sir, it has been perverted to the carrying out of the most threatening communism that has been witnessed in this country since the formation of the Government.

Here we are to-day doing what? Acting as assessors of the revenue necessary for the Government? No, sir; in not a single speech on this floor has there been any defense of the bill upon the idea of revenue; there is no pretext that these duties are levied for revenue purposes. Every item in the bill, and every argument made in support of it, proceeds upon the theory that we are here simply as the agents and attorneys of certain protected interests in this country, to take care of them without regard to revenue and at the expense of the people of this country. We are perverting the taxing power of this Government. We are teaching the people of the nation that Congress itself is the representative of communism; that the sole purpose of this body on the tariff question is to enable certain people to make a living and to levy duties so as to maintain them in their industries. In other words, that this is a paternal Government, under which industries may be organized by special legislation, and special privileges and advantages be granted by Congressional enactment. Gentlemen on the other side undertake to defend this bill solely upon that ground and upon no other.

Sir, if certain industries of this country are to be maintained by Congressional enactment, why not all industries? Why is it not right that the farmers of this country should ask that the paternal hand of the Government be extended to protect them against the trusts and combines that we are organizing here? They are demanding that the Federal Government shall, in the exercise of its legislative authority, provide that their commodities shall be protected from confiscation and cheap markets; that they shall have the right to deposit their produce in Government warehouses for the purpose of having money issued upon it. They are demanding freer markets; they are demanding the protection of the Government; and if we are going into this communistic legislation they have a right to demand everything in that direction. I denounce this system of legislation as a conspiracy against the liberties of our people and a degradation of the functions of the Government.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLAND. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move to strike out, in clause 108, the following words:

But if filled, and not otherwise provided for in this act, and the contents are not subject to an ad valorem rate of duty or to rate of duty based on the value, or are free of duty, such bottles, vials, or other vessels shall pay, in addition to the duty, if any, on their contents, the rates of duty prescribed in the preceding paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, what I shall say on this paragraph will apply as well to the preceding clause, clause 107, to which reference is made in the pending paragraph. I have made some calculation as to what will be the rate of duty under clause 107. I will first read from testimony taken before the Committee on Ways and Means. On page 450 Mr. William Elliott Smith says:

While I was in Germany I found out the cost of the German ware. In order to do that I bought 500 gross. Our cost of blowing this bottle is 53 cents gross. I bought that in Berlin at 80 marks, which is 44 cents gross. We figure by the gross and the Germans figure by the hundred. That bottle runs 9 pounds to the gross. That would make 53 cents, etc.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the bottle it seems costs 44 cents; and, according to that, this bill would raise the duty on some classes of bottles 100 per cent.; and from the investigation I have been able to make I am satisfied that in other cases it would go as high as 200 per cent., and on the very small medicine vials as high as 300 and 400 per cent. I have made a calculation that upon the first class of bottles embraced in these two paragraphs there is added by this bill to the present duty of 63.48 per cent. 25 per cent., making the net rate of duty more than 80 per cent. And this applies to all bottles containing not less than a quart. On the next class of bottles there would be an increase of 50 per cent. upon the existing duty of 52.94 per cent., making the duty over 75 per cent.; and on the next class the duty will be over 100 per cent. These are the rates which will be imposed under these two clauses, 107, 108.

The present rate of duty on this kind of ware is 1 cent per pound. What is the pretext under which this increase is to be made? It is claimed it is for the purpose of protecting labor, to assist the labor-

ing man. Yet one gentleman who appeared before the committee, whose statement is embraced in these hearings and upon whose statement in part the increases in this glass schedule has been made, is now engaged in a controversy with the United States Government, in which he is charged with having imported contract laborers in violation of law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As so much has been said about labor here, as so great a pretense is made that gentlemen here are actuated solely by their interest in the laborer, let us see what were the facts in that case. Chambers & McKee, of Jeannette, Pa., are charged with having imported through Mr. Campbell, a witness in these hearings, twenty-six glass-blowers from England.

A MEMBER. How long ago?

Mr. McMILLIN. Only last year; since the last election of 1888; since all this clamor was made that you were seeking this solely to benefit the American laborer. In the face of the fact that laborers have thus been imported, we see there is in this bill a vast increase in the rates of duty proposed on the articles manufactured by these gentlemen. They got what they wanted, notwithstanding their illegal importations. Complaint was made at the Treasury Department and an investigation was had. Why are they not punished?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BERGEN. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee know that this very importation of labor to which he refers is an argument against his position on this floor? Because labor in this country demands and receives such a price that the manufacturer can not put the articles referred to in this item upon the market, in competition with the foreign product, and therefore goes abroad to secure laborers at the cheaper prices they there obtain. I do not refer to this to justify the act. This side of the House reprobates all proceedings of the kind, and I venture to say that the gentleman who did it, if the truth were known, is a Democrat. [Laughter.]

But the gentleman has referred to some other matters to which I wish to call attention, particularly that by this bill an increase is made of the duty upon some of these articles. Let that be admitted. Why is it done? Simply because the articles have been driven out of the American manufactory.

The manufacturer here of the small vial and the different grades of bottles to which the gentleman thus refers is driven out of our market and the same is supplied by the foreign importer. You will see in the schedule which has been put into the hands of the House for its information during this discussion a large quantity of goods which come into this country at pound rates. The reference is to these articles. Something like 17,000,000 pounds were imported in 1889, amounting in value to over \$300,000,000. We wish that the American laborer shall have that money, that the American laborer should supply those goods to our American consumers. And you on the other side of the House are constantly rising up and pretending to defend American labor, when with all the power of your voice you are assailing it and doing what you can to crush the laborer when he most needs your help.

I would, Mr. Chairman, if I had the time, go through all the list to which the gentleman has referred. He has referred to the small vials and to larger vials, and to bottles, which have a prescribed percentage of 1 cent a pound. But it is only necessary to say that wherever he shows an increase in the bill—and I make this statement in a general way because my time is short—wherever there is an increase, it is because the American goods of that character have been driven out of the market, and the demand is supplied from abroad. I care not whether it be a half-ounce vial or a 12-ounce vial or a quart bottle, he is robbed of his market whenever the American laborer is robbed of the power to produce it here in competition with the foreign product.

Much has been said about a tax, but it seems very strange to me that gentlemen on the other side do not discover that there is no tax except when there is imposed upon the laborer some burden. There is no tax upon the inn-keeper if I go to him and get my dinner and pay him his price of \$1.50 for it. He does not suffer from the transaction. The gain is really his. So the American laborer is not suffering from any tax when he gets the profit that comes from his labor, and that is the result always when you manufacture goods here which supply the American market. That is what we ought to do. That is what we seek to do by this bill, and that is what we will do ultimately under its protective provisions. [Applause.]

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from New Jersey speaks of the importations of glass into this country. Does he not know the fact that we are also large exporters of glass? Does he not know the fact that we exported last year a large amount from this country?

Mr. BERGEN. Yes, I do; and I am glad of it; and I mean we shall go on and export much more. But it was not of this kind.

Mr. McMILLIN. And if the increased duty were necessary, as it is alleged by these gentlemen, this exportation could not go on. It could not have been done without we produced that glass as cheaply as foreign countries did.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Will the gentleman kindly inform us what particular variety of glass was exported?

Mr. McMILLIN. I am unable to say that; I have not seen the itemized statement, but have taken the statement from a condensed report,

which shows that during the last year we exported \$894,200 worth; we are therefore exporters of glass; and I ask the gentleman if that exportation does not come in competition with England, with Germany, and France, and with every other people who engage in this industry. Gentlemen claim that these countries are now competing with us, and destroying our market; I ask if we do not have to compete with them when we make these shipments abroad?

Now, Mr. Chairman, to return to the question I was on when interrupted by the expiration of my time. I state further that some of these gentlemen whose evidence has been taken here and relied on by the Committee on Ways and Means to sustain their position, instead of being exporters of glass, were importers of glass laborers in violation of the law. They were imported from free-trade England. Your British subject was brought here by contract to interfere with the American laboring man.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. McMILLIN. Yes.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. When was this done?

Mr. McMILLIN. It was done last year, under this present Administration, and up to to-day there has not been a conviction because the prosecutions have been held up or delayed in some way.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Had there been any convictions for the four previous years that the same law was on the statute-books?

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. It was not violated.

Mr. McMILLIN. Democrats do not violate the law. They are law-abiding citizens. [Laughter and derisive applause on Republican side.]

Now, the gentleman from New Jersey says that he will insure that this man was a Democrat that has imported these laborers; that was his statement, if I understood him correctly. Whenever he furnishes that proof I will endeavor to show him that he is entirely wrong, and that this party was not a Democrat. Mr. Campbell was a campaigner for President Harrison. [Laughter and applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. BERGEN. So were a great many other glass men, and they will be for the next campaign.

Mr. McMILLIN. Do you confess it; do you say a great many more will be campaigning in the next election? Are you paying back your last campaign debts by this bill's increases? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BERGEN. I do not pay the debts in that way. They are only paid on the other side in that sort of coin. [Laughter and applause on Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. Do you confess you are bidding for the next campaign instead of legislating for the good of the people? You are more candid than I expected you to be.

Now, while it was claimed that all of this was done for labor, the contract laborers have been imported and the law violated for greed and gain. Chambers & McKee and Campbell are the men charged with importing twenty-six contract laborers from England to work in the glass-works at Jeannette, Pa.

Information was filed in the proper department, hearings were had at Pittsburgh (and these men were put in the works there), and yet to-day, notwithstanding the proof, there has been no conviction. Let the people of the country understand that while you are legislating to keep out the products of the world and restricting their markets, you are at the same time bringing in contract laborers, to work at lower prices in direct competition with our own people.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Chairman, it is due to say as to the gentlemen of Pittsburgh who have been named, and it is due also to say as to the Administration and the implied imputation upon either, that such imputation is unfounded, unjust, and uncalled for.

Mr. SPRINGER. What is that?

Mr. BAYNE. It was the Republican Secretary of the Treasury who ordered the investigation of this affair. It was by the direction of the present Republican Attorney-General that suit has been instituted. The suit is now pending in the United States district court for the western district of Pennsylvania, and will be tried, I believe, as soon as they get through the cases of a criminal nature now before that court—probably this week.

Mr. McMILLIN. Why were they held up thus long?

Mr. BAYNE. And if there were any delay about it, and if there is now any delay about the prosecution of the suit, it is chargeable to the Democratic chairman of the Allegheny County executive committee, who has been furnishing the evidence and assisting the United States district attorney in the prosecution.

Mr. McMILLIN. Hurrah for our Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BAYNE. So, if there be any delay it is a delay which has been caused by his want of diligence in the prosecution of the matter.

I want to say that to bring here before the House of Representatives reputable gentlemen, such as Mr. James Campbell, who is a reputable man and a man who has an honorable record in every respect and against whose word and character and reputation no man can say a word, and to bring other gentlemen here, the proprietors of the Jeannette works, who are as reputable citizens as any in this country, and to assail them as a mere make-shift and *ad captandum* argument in the

formation of a tariff measure seems to be uncalled for and unjustifiable.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Was there during the entire period of the last Administration a single case of enforcement of the contract-labor law?

Mr. BAYNE. I believe there was one case where they convicted a minister of the gospel who was imported into New York. That was the only case I know of. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I do not know of any others.

Mr. KILGORE. I can furnish you cases.

Mr. BAYNE. I have the floor, I believe. I believe there was one case of conviction of a minister brought into New York for some congregation, and he had to pay a fine of a thousand dollars. I do know that the workingmen and that the workingmen's organizations throughout the United States are complaining that the law against contract labor under the last Administration was not only not enforced, but it seems to me that there was no effort made to enforce that law.

Mr. CUTCHEON. These gentlemen have not had their trial, I understand.

Mr. BAYNE. No.

Mr. CUTCHEON. They have not been convicted, except by the gentlemen from Tennessee.

Mr. KILGORE. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR] desires to know if there were any prosecutions during the last Administration against persons for violating the law against the introduction of laborers from abroad under contract. I would like to say a word or two on this question as I think I can furnish the gentleman some information on the subject. Some time in the latter part of the year 1885 Mr. Gus. Wilke, the subcontractor who undertook the erection of the Texas State capitol, at Austin, Tex., introduced some sixty-five stone-cutters from Scotland under contract to work on the capitol building.

In 1886 prosecutions were instituted in each case by a Democratic district attorney who had the cases so well prepared that no defense was interposed, as I understand, except for purposes of delay. The Government recovered, and a fine of \$1,000 was imposed in each case, making in all about \$65,000. None of this amount has ever been paid, and the defendant is now seeking relief at the hands of the present Administration.

Mr. CUTCHEON. How many foreign laborers did the contractor import?

Mr. KILGORE. Sixty-five, I understand.

Mr. CRAIN. And for each one of these he was fined \$1,000 and the money has not yet been paid.

Mr. BYNUM. I did not know that I should have said anything upon this question except upon the strong denial on the other side of the fact that Republicans have been engaged in the importation of labor in violation of the law.

Not only has the gentleman from Texas called attention to the fact that in the State of Texas there were sixty-five convictions, but he might have gone further and stated that the contractor engaged in the construction of the state-house of Texas is a Republican Senator at the present time.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Is not that the only reason why he was prosecuted?

Mr. BYNUM. Now, sir, an investigating committee was sent to New York during the last session of Congress, and Congressman Ford, of Michigan, was chairman. At the very time they were holding the investigation there they discovered a violation of the law by Mr. Lee, a Republican manufacturer, who has been a howling protectionist for the interests of our laborers, and he was importing contract labor. He was caught in that. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] There was no question about that. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says that Mr. Campbell is a man of reputation and character. I here and now pronounce him a perjurer, and I can prove what I say. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman came here before the committee to hold a consultation with the gentleman from West Virginia and myself upon the subject of glass. He went away and made an affidavit that was false from beginning to end, and if he had ever entered the district I represent and made that affidavit he would have been within the cells of a prison to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the character of the man.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Why did you not go after him? The United States courts—

Mr. BYNUM. Oh, I can not run over the country after every lying Republican. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Now I have made charges.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is in the interest of labor. Labor! Why, the committee in the formation of this bill closed the doors of the Capitol against the labor of this country, but admitted manufacturers. They raised the curtain and peeped out to see who was there. The very entrance of the Capitol was closed in order to keep any one from going in but those they would allow, and they admitted the manufacturers to present their side, but if the honest laborer came there and knocked at the door he was not admitted.

Mr. BAYNE. It is a serious matter to charge a gentleman of Mr. Campbell's reputation with the crime of perjury.

Mr. BYNUM. It is, and I knew it was when I charged it.

Mr. BAYNE. I suppose you did, but it is a very serious matter to do, and I have only this to say, that I should take his word as soon as I would take that of the Representative from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] on any occasion, and I know them both. [Laughter.] I want to say further that Mr. Campbell was the chosen representative of a large organization of reputable workingmen of this country and is to-day, and any indignity or any insult offered to him is offered to every member of that organization. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is an indignity to the workingmen that the grand jury have indicted this man.

Mr. BAYNE. And I pledge my word and honor, Mr. Chairman, that he will be here before this discussion is over and will place the affidavit to which reference has been made in the light in which it is to be held by the people of this country who examine judicially matters of that kind. Although this be the House of Representatives, there is no authority under the Constitution for any member of this House to assail the character or the reputation of citizens simply because they differ with him in politics. Such an act is as foreign to my nature as anything can be. I never impugn the motives of any man, much less of a Representative here. I have never questioned the motives of gentlemen who have appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in favor of lower rates of duty and have made their arguments therefor. And I am glad to say for my Republican brethren that not one of them has cast an imputation upon the character of any of the gentlemen who have appeared here in opposition to this bill and to the policy embodied in it. It was left for the *ad captandum* argument, for the argument that comes from the other side, to cast slurs upon decent citizens in order to maintain the theory which gentlemen upon that side choose to entertain.

Mr. CHEADLE. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] has made a statement in regard to the refusal of the committee to give the workingmen a hearing. I should like to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania on that point.

Mr. BAYNE. The doors of the committee-room have been open to everybody. I did not hear a single allegation that anybody was not given an opportunity to be heard by the committee until it came from my good friend from New York [Mr. FLOWER], when he said yesterday that there were gentlemen here desirous of being heard on the tin-plate industry; and after he made that statement I left the Hall and went into the committee-room and found that it was brim full of gentlemen who were being heard upon the tin-plate industry. [Laughter and applause upon the Republican side.] So that, even during the sessions of the House, when we are engaged here in the consideration of this bill, that committee has been giving hearings to every one who desires them. And I may add that the gentlemen who were heard yesterday were not manufacturers, but importers.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I simply want to observe that I am obliged to confirm what my friend from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] has said about Mr. Campbell. Mr. Campbell came here and had an interview with the gentleman from Indiana and myself, then members of the Ways and Means Committee, and then he went off and made statements about us that were utterly and absolutely false. He tried afterwards to bolster up those statements by his affidavit. That affidavit was prepared in Pittsburgh, and, accompanied with some testimonials as to Mr. Campbell's character, was circulated by tens of thousands in my district.

Wherever the coal miners were to be found it was there; wherever there was a laboring man to be found, that affidavit was to be found also, and through the press at the time and upon every stump in the district I felt it to be my duty to denounce this man as a perjurer, and to say that the affidavit was from beginning to end a "bottomless lie." [Applause on the Democratic side.] I stated that upon the stump, I published it in the papers over my district, and I know to-day from the vote in that district that not a man, woman, or child believed the affidavit. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BAYNE. About the affidavit I know nothing whatever. I do not know even to what affidavit allusion is made. I never heard of it before, but I never heard of a charge of that kind made against Mr. Campbell, and I never will believe a charge of that kind against him until he shall have been convicted in a court of justice.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to strike out the last word. [Laughter.] I am surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania requires so much testimony in order to convince him of a question of fact. The statements of these two honorable gentlemen here [Mr. BYNUM and Mr. WILSON], made upon their responsibility as representatives of the people, would convict Mr. Campbell of perjury in any court in the world [applause on the Democratic side]; yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania says he does not believe those statements. I will venture to say that every gentleman within the sound of my voice believes them. [Cries of "No!" "No!" from the Republican side.] Let any gentleman who says "no" rise to his feet and state that he does not believe them.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Let me make a suggestion to my friend from Illinois. These gentlemen [Mr. BYNUM and Mr. WILSON] doubtless

have entire confidence in their statement; now let them publish it over their own names in the newspapers of this city—

Mr. BYNUM. It has been published over our own names.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is now published here; it is put into the official records of this Government by two as honorable gentlemen as any who sit upon this floor or in any legislative body in the world, yet you gentlemen on the other side pretend to say that you do not believe it. Why, this testimony would convict any one of you of perjury in any court in the world, and you know it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CUTCHEON. That might depend upon whether the jury believed the witnesses.

Mr. SPRINGER. The jury would believe them and the American people will believe them.

A MEMBER. The grand jury believed it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, the grand jury believed it; and the man who is now defended by you is under indictment.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. Now, I hope we shall have a vote.

Mr. CRAIN. In opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the last word, I presume I am entitled under the rules to five minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am conscious, from my personal knowledge of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], that he would long hesitate to do any injustice to any gentleman, whether a member of Congress or a private citizen. He has—inadvertently, I believe—cast a reflection upon a member of the Senate who happens to be a Republican, by associating him with the contractor or subcontractor to whom my colleague alluded when a few moments ago he stated that in the circuit court or district court at Austin he had been fined \$65,000. Now, I personally know that the Republican Senator to whom the gentleman from Indiana alluded had nothing whatever to do with the importation of those contract laborers.

Mr. BYNUM. I did not charge that he had. I said he was one of the original contractors.

Mr. CRAIN. He was one of the original contractors with the State of Texas to erect a capitol building for the State, and next to this capitol it is the finest building in the Union. He made a contract with a subcontractor to do the work. That subcontractor imported these people, and he was convicted of the offense and fined. Under the circumstances I am certain the gentleman from Indiana will retract the imputation he has cast upon the Republican Senator referred to.

Mr. BYNUM. I did not mean to convey the idea that Senator FARWELL was the party who had imported the laborers, but that he was one of the original contractors for the building, and that under his contract the subcontractor made the importation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentlemen from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN].

The question being taken, there were—ayes 51, noes 85.

Mr. BLAND. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. McMILLIN were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 51, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FLOWER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state, in regard to the hearings by the Ways and Means Committee, that both the majority and the minority of the committee have sat in their room from the day after Christmas until the present time, and that I do not know of a single manufacturer or laborer who desired to be heard that has not been accorded a full and free hearing. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I wish to state further that when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE], my colleague on the committee, challenged the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] in regard to the tin-plate industry, he did not know whereof he was speaking. He had stated the day before that of the three thousand firms of tin-canners in the country all but nine hundred had signed petitions for the increase of the duty on tin-plate. But while he was talking forty men, representatives of the National Canners' Association, who had presented to the committee a statement of their grievances on account of the increased duty on tin-plate, were then in the committee-room and had not been heard by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. When he said that all the representatives of that industry had been heard, it was then I challenged his statement, because those forty men were then waiting to be heard, all of them representing the National Canners' Association and opposed to the increased rate of duty. The gentleman then, as I am informed, went out and heard those gentlemen, and learned, just as I had stated, that they were not satisfied with this tin-plate duty.

Mr. MCKINLEY. And they were all heard. In this connection I want to say there has not been a single interest in this country that asked for a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee that had not been heard. [Applause on the Republican side.] Manufacturers, laborers, consumers, importers, consignors, consignees—free-traders and protectionists—all who have presented themselves at the door of the Committee on Ways and Means have been heard [applause], and they

are being heard now while we are considering this bill in the House. This morning at half past 9 o'clock the committee met, and sat continuously until 11, to hear a gentleman upon certain schedules. We are to meet to-morrow morning; and we shall continue to meet and hear all the great interests of this country until this bill shall finally be passed through this House. [Applause.]

I want to say another thing, Mr. Chairman. The imputation of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] that we have closed up the passage to this House in order that we might have a private consultation room for members of the majority of the committee is false; it is untrue. [Applause on the Republican side.] I want to say to him that the Committee on Ways and Means, crowded as it was by the representatives of the great interests of the country, found that it had no room for consultation, no room in which the committee could go into executive session. Every member of that committee, Democrat and Republican, signed a request to the Speaker of this House asking to have an additional room, a private room, assigned to the committee; and the selection of the room out here was made by the Speaker, in company with Mr. CARLISLE, the leader on the other side of the House, and myself, it being the best we could possibly do under the circumstances.

I want to say further that the minority of the Ways and Means Committee have always had access to that room (is not that so, gentlemen of the minority?) and have used it whenever they wanted to use it. And when they were preparing their minority report they had almost exclusive use of that committee-room. Mr. Chairman, I do not permit any man to impute to the majority of that committee improper motives or want of courtesy toward the minority. The minority members know that any imputation of that kind is absolutely false, and, if made, is made by some one ignorant of the relations of gentlemen on that committee. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is somewhat vehement in replying to the charges or the statements I have made. I stated that the eastern entrance of the Capitol had been closed up, which is a fact. It is a public entrance to this Capitol, and it was closed up; curtains were placed over the doors; nobody could enter—

Mr. MCKINLEY. Let the stenographer read exactly what you said.

Mr. BYNUM. I have no objection to that, but I prefer to occupy my own time. It will be in the RECORD unless the gentleman claims that it is unparliamentary and should go out on that ground. I do not charge here, and I do not wish to be understood as charging— [Cries of "Read!" "Read!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I do not desire, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Indiana prefers it, to interrupt him now; but I only ask, of course, that what he did say shall stand upon the RECORD as he said it.

Mr. BYNUM. I have just said that it will so appear in the RECORD. I shall make no change in it. I say I do not wish to charge here, and I do not charge here, for I have too high a respect—no man has a higher respect for the gentleman from Ohio than I have; my relations with him have always been pleasant, and I say I mean to charge nothing against him in that connection. But what I mean to say, and what I stand by, is that the manufacturers of this country, whenever a tariff bill is to be passed, come to this House and are heard; and right this day, while discussing this very earthenware schedule, there has been the largest manufacturer of the country on the floor of this House.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Who is it?

Mr. BYNUM. I say while discussing this earthenware schedule today one of the largest manufacturers of this country was on the floor of the House.

Mr. KILGORE. In defiance of the rules of the House?

Mr. BYNUM. Now, I do not undertake to say that anybody who came here for that purpose has been excluded from a hearing. I do not charge that. The gentleman and his committee probably heard them. But we all heard in the Fiftieth Congress (and the gentlemen here are talking of treating with respect the charges that were made and heralded all over the country during that Congress) that the majority of the Ways and Means Committee then of the House was engaged, in the formation of that bill, in a "conspiracy," that they were getting up a "midnight bill." The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] charged it directly.

Mr. CHEADLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYNUM. I have not time now to be bothered with questions. The gentleman from Ohio made the same charge. It was reported everywhere, promulgated throughout the length and breadth of the land, that we were getting up a midnight bill. It was heralded then (because I had the honor to be a member of the majority at that time)—it was charged that we were treating the minority with disrespect. Now, if they did not give currency to that sentiment themselves they acquiesced in it at least, and yet in this Congress the very same methods precisely, Mr. Chairman, were pursued in the formation of the bill. They formulated a bill which was given out to the country, and this extra room was used for that purpose.

It was framed off as a private committee-room, the gentleman says, and for the use of his committee. Now, I understand that the committee-room itself is private; that no man has a right to enter the room set apart for the use of the committee against its wishes or when it is

in session; that they have a gentleman, a messenger, sitting at the door, who is paid by the House to guard against intrusions. What was the special room provided for, then? It was provided for the purpose (and I want to be perfectly fair about the statement) that when consultations that the majority, or perhaps the minority, might want to have with any person under that schedule secretly, they could have the opportunity there. If that was not the object, I would like to know from the gentleman from Ohio what the object was.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Why, Mr. Chairman, I have already stated to the gentleman the object of having the room was for the convenience of the committee, and there is not a gentleman on the Ways and Means Committee that does not know that what I state is exactly true. That room is as accessible to the Democrats as to the Republicans. It has always been, and we did not get it assigned to us until the bill was ready to be reported.

Mr. BYNUM. Until it was published to the country.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I do not remember that; and it is not essential.

Mr. BYNUM. But it is a fact that this main entrance to the Capitol, not a room at all, has been closed up, and is to-day closed up, by the request of the gentleman and his committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Before the gentleman takes his seat will he be kind enough to give the name of the manufacturer to whom he referred?

Mr. BYNUM. I understand Mr. Brewer was here.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Do you state that as a fact?

Mr. BYNUM. I state it upon information. A gentleman was pointed out to me as Mr. Brewer.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Well, he is in Trenton, and I will telegraph him to know if he is here. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYNUM. I do not know the gentleman myself, but the statement I made was on information. Of course, if he has not been on the floor of the House I owe him an apology.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Brewer has not been here. I understand from the gentleman from New Jersey that he is not in the city.

Mr. BYNUM. What does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] say?

Mr. GEAR. I do not know the gentleman, but I can only say this: That, being an ex-member, if he was in the city he had a right to the floor.

Mr. MCKINLEY. He is an honorable gentleman, and he would be here for no other than an honorable purpose if he was in the city at all. [Applause.] The pottery industry needs no lobby. It has got friends enough on this floor, as the recent vote demonstrates. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BYNUM. Then I am satisfied that I was mistaken.

Mr. GEAR. The gentleman that you saw sitting near me was a friend of mine, an ex-member of the House, a personal friend, Judge Valentine, of Nebraska.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, it is due to the committee to state that all parties, so far as I know, who have applied for a hearing have had it before the committee. I think it but proper to state that. I must state in candor, however, that I do not think they were much heeded when they were on the wrong side of the question, looking at it from the views of the majority of the committee; but the hearings have been granted.

As to the room assigned, to which the chairman refers, the facts are these, so far as I know: During the holidays we had to remain here and forego our home Christmas turkey listening to the arguments of different parties who sought to have changes made in the tariff schedules. The room of the committee was crowded and cramped. Finally a petition was presented to me one day to ask the Speaker to assign to the committee the room that is now held by the Sergeant-at-Arms, as an annex room to the Committee on Ways and Means, making the room similar somewhat to the Committee on Appropriations on the opposite side of the hall. I will state here that I hesitated about making the request, but in view of the fact that changes going on in that room had made it much less important to the members of the House, the accounts not being kept there, as heretofore, and the necessity for their going there much less than before, I finally signed the petition.

There was no petition for the assignment of the entrance spoken of by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY]. I ought to say also, as I propose to deal with nothing but candor, that I should not have favored that assignment, although I did favor the other.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means whether the farmers and mechanics did not have a fair hearing before that committee.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I supposed I had stated that, but, if not, I want to say now that the farmers have been fully heard by the committee. The President of the National Grange and his associates have been before the committee over and over again. Only yesterday we heard the Farmers' Alliance; we heard them again to-day, and we have agreed to hear them to-morrow, and the next day if necessary, for the completion of the arguments which they desire to present. And while I am on my feet I wish to say that we not only heard everybody that I have named, but we heard also at great length the "Parsee merchant," Mr.

J. S. Moore, a gentleman who is known to be almost the leader of the Democratic party upon the revenue-tariff theory which they advocate here. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLAND. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, as this comes within the line of the remarks which I was making a moment ago, I propose to pursue the same line of thought.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will give way a moment the Chair will direct the reading of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], called for by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY].

Mr. BLAND. If that means another debate of this kind, I hope I may be permitted to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the purpose of the Chair to take up the debate again after this matter is disposed of.

Mr. BLAND. I thought the Chair was going to order the reading of an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is going to order the reading of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, called for by the gentleman from Ohio, after which the Chair will again recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. I desire to proceed, Mr. Chairman. I do not know by what rule that matter can be read now. It is not an amendment and it is not a subject of debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] demanded the reading of a portion of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM].

Mr. BLAND. Then he ought to have had it read in his own time.

The CHAIRMAN. That demand having been made, the Chair thereupon directed the Reporter to read the notes, but by unanimous consent the gentleman proceeded with his remarks while the notes were being extended, and now the transcript is here subject to the order of the committee.

Mr. BLAND. Well, if the gentleman from Ohio desires them read, why does not he have them read in his own time?

The CHAIRMAN. The reading will not be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] asks now for the reading of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM].

Mr. MCKINLEY. I do not ask that the remarks be read, Mr. Chairman. I only want to emphasize my understanding of what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] had said, and I know that the RECORD will show to-morrow morning what he did say.

Mr. BYNUM. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I made no reflection upon the honor or the integrity of the committee, and if there is anything in my language that means such a reflection I withdraw it. I had no intention of making any such charge. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side and cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BLAND. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can have order I would like to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. BLAND. As I was proceeding to say a few minutes ago, we are here and the Committee on Ways and Means are here to all intents and purposes not to hear the laboring people. They have no reason to be heard. It is the manufacturer himself who fixes the wages that he will pay, and the laborer has got to accept those wages. The manufacturer comes here and demands at the hands of the Ways and Means Committee a protection sufficient, according to his own view, to yield him a communistic profit irrespective of anything the laboring man may have to say in regard to it. The laboring man is not consulted about it, and it is no use for him to come here and ask to be heard.

Now, I charge upon you gentlemen on the other side of the House that you have heard the manufacturer and have put his "hearings" into the shape of law in your bill. [Laughter.] I charge that you have put these schedules in here for his benefit and his protection, and I charge that you will not put into the forms of law the demands of those who appeared on behalf of the farmers. You dare not do it, and you know you will not do it. [Laughter on the Republican side.] You know there has been demanded on behalf of the farmers a participation in this communistic legislation. You know that they have demanded at the hands of Congress a certain kind of "protection" of farm products, that is, that they may be warehoused, and money loaned upon them, and you know you will not agree to that. You have "heard" the farmer, but you will deny his demands. You know you are going to do it. [Laughter.] You heard the representatives of the communism of capital, and you have complied with their demands, but you deny the same right to the farmer because you do not propose to enact his demands into the form of law. I charge that upon you, and I want you to deny it if you can. If you propose to go into this communistic legislation by which you are to take care of the capital employed in manufactures, you are disgracing the Congress of this country if you do not hear the farmers also, and legislate as they demand.

Now, come to the scratch, gentlemen. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You know that the laborer and farmer have no friends on that side. [Cries of "Louder!" "Louder!"] You know that the capital

you represent purchases the election of Presidents. [Cries of "Louder!" "Louder!"] Now, I have made charges and the results will prove them to be true. [Cries of "Louder!" "Louder!"] You will denounce as communism the demands of the farmers and laborers, but vote communistic profits to capital and wealth. [Loud applause on the Democratic side and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I move to strike out the last word. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. Mr. Chairman, awhile ago something was said about the enforcement of the law prohibiting the importation of aliens under contract to perform labor in this country. Early in the session I introduced a resolution of inquiry addressed to the Attorney-General of the United States asking for information in regard to suits that had been brought by the United States or in the name of the United States against parties alleged to have violated said law.

The resolution sought such information as would enable Congress and the country to know how the law had been enforced. The Attorney-General replied to the resolution on the 7th of February last, and his reply is known as Executive Document No. 206, and I now desire for a few moments to call the attention of the House to his report. In this report the names of the defendants, the number of the case, the venue thereof, as well as the final judgment and subsequent action thereon, are given.

It appears that under the act of February 26, 1885, there had been instituted two hundred and twenty-four suits, and one hundred and forty-three of those suits are now pending and fifty-six of them have been compromised by this Government with the parties who were sued. Why one hundred and forty-three of these suits are now pending—that is to say, why they have not been prosecuted to judgment—the report of the Attorney-General fails to show.

Sixty-six of these cases were brought since the advent of this Administration, and in sixty out of these sixty-six cases there appears to have been no action taken by the courts before whom they were brought, nor does the Attorney-General give any reason for this non-action or delay. Certainly a greater number of these cases should have been more vigorously prosecuted than appears to have been done. Now let me call your attention to some of these cases.

I first call your attention to a suit brought by this Government against the Northfield Knife Company, F. H. Catlin and J. Howard Catlin. This suit was brought in the district of Connecticut on the 4th of November, 1886, and judgment was recovered for \$15,000, and compromised for \$100 and costs, costing the defendants in all \$156.93.

Mr. SAYERS. When was that done?

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. November 25, 1887.

I next call your attention to the suits brought by the United States against the Bay State Brick Company. There were five of these suits brought in the district of Massachusetts for \$1,000 in each case, and the report shows that all of said cases were settled by a consent judgment of \$1,000 in favor of the United States.

Was this a proper enforcement of the law? If the parties were guilty of violating the law why should this judge in Massachusetts have permitted them to escape upon the payment of the penalty in one case? In the case of the United States vs. John Craig, brought in the district of Michigan for \$1,000, the defendant escaped by paying \$100.

There was another suit brought in the district of Michigan. It was against one H. D. Williams, and was brought for the sum of \$1,000, and the defendant settled it and went unwhipped of justice by paying \$5 and costs. I invite your attention particularly to the next case. I presume the defendant is one of the "great American industries," who demand protection for American labor against the "pauper labor" of Europe. I said case, I should have said cases.

There were forty-eight suits brought by the United States against the Riverside and Oswego mills in the district of Rhode Island. Each suit was for the sum of \$1,000, and judgment for \$1,000 was entered in one case and a judgment for \$1 in each of the other cases. This great American industry was sued for \$48,000, and a Republican judge permitted it to settle for the sum of \$1,143.24, including costs. Was not this a very mockery of justice?

Why should the court have permitted forty-seven judgments for \$1 each to be entered when the defendants were sued for the sum of \$47,000? Remember, this was a compromise carried into effect by a judgment of the court. Do you call this an enforcement of law?

Something has been said about the suit brought by the United States against Gus. Wilke and others in the western district of Texas. Wilke and his partners were the contractors who built the State-house or capitol of Texas. I do not know who the partners of Wilke were in this contract, but no matter who they were, they violated the law by importing Scotch stone-masons under contract to work on the new capitol of Texas. For doing this a judgment was recovered against them for \$63,000.

Mr. ROGERS. What is the stay of execution?

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. The report says the execution was staid for twelve months on payment of costs to give defendants time to apply to Congress for relief, and that \$705 have been paid into the Treasury— [Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. I should be glad of an opportunity to give the whole of these cases.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I can be recognized I will yield my time to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform the gentleman from Indiana that that can not be done under the rule, but the gentleman can extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. I want to say what I have to say here and now. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will be recognized.

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. What I desire to say is that if verdicts are returned that are excessive in amount, and not warranted by the evidence, it is the duty of courts to set such verdicts aside, but courts should not nullify the law by permitting compromises to be made and embodied in the judgments entered upon their records.

Why should a court grant a stay of execution for twelve months on payment of costs to permit the defendants to apply to Congress for relief? Shall Congress relieve against the penalty imposed for violating a law passed by Congress? If these judgments had been properly enforced there would not have been so many violations of the law prohibiting the importation of foreign labor into this country under contract. The manner in which the law has been executed by the courts of this country has brought it into contempt.

It is unnecessary for me to say that, in most of the cases cited, the judges before whom such cases were tried are Republicans. If the courts had executed the law in regard to the suits which have been instituted, some good might have been accomplished for the laboring element in this country. They might have escaped the competition of the "pauper labor of Europe" which was brought here by great American industries to deprive them of work or to reduce their wages.

But as this law has been enforced it is a mere farce, and yields no benefit whatever to the laboring classes of this country against aliens who are brought here under contract to perform labor. When gentlemen upon this floor assert that they are the friends of labor I ask why it is that when this act of Congress prohibiting the importation of foreign labor is sought to be enforced in behalf of the workmen of this country it is set aside, nullified and rendered of no avail, by the courts of this country?

In many instances labor organizations in the different States have contributed money, paid their funds, and employed counsel to prosecute persons who had violated the law prohibiting the importation of foreign labor; but, notwithstanding their efforts to bring such persons to justice, they have been too frequently defeated by the courts and officers of the Government, who have been disposed to let the guilty escape.

What American workmen now want is not so much gush from the Republican party about the rights of American labor as it does want the enforcement of a law which originated in and was passed by a Democratic House and had for its purpose the protection of American labor from the competition of cheap labor that capital was importing from Europe. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] You have never yet shown by your votes that you had any favor to show to the American workman, and you always discriminate against labor in favor of capital.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] keeps repeating here upon the floor time and again the proposition that the only object of this bill is to protect somebody. Now, I repeat again that the main object of this bill is to secure the necessary revenue to carry on the Government, and in doing that at the same time to take proper care of American labor. That is the position of the Republican party to-day, and that has been the position of the Republican party since it was organized in 1860.

I desire the Clerk to read the platform of the Republican party in 1860.

The Clerk read as follows:

That while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such adjustment of these imports as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we recommend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the workmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Now, this committee, following the exact suggestion embraced in that resolution, present their report here stating the object of this bill and the purposes they have in view in its passage. I ask the Clerk to read an extract from their report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee, responding, as it believes, to the sentiment of the country and the recommendations of the President, submit what they consider to be a just and equitable revision of the tariff, which, while preserving that measure of protection which is required for our industrial independence, will secure a reduction of the revenue both from customs and internal-revenue sources.

We have not looked alone to a reduction of the revenue, but have kept steadily in view the interests of our producing classes, and have been ever mindful of that which is due to our political conditions, our labor, and the character of our citizenship. We have realized that a reduction of duties below the difference between the cost of labor and production in competing countries and our own would result either in the abandonment of much of our manufacturing here or in the depression of our labor. Either result would bring disaster, the extent of which no one can measure.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Now, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding this declaration that this bill has been adopted by the committee and is to be passed on that line, the gentleman from Missouri rises here day after day and continues to reiterate that this revenue measure, which is to provide money to carry on the Government, to pay the necessary pensions, and all other legitimate expenses of the Government, has no other object than simply to protect manufactures.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Does the gentleman consider it necessary, in the present state of the Government, to increase taxation \$40,000,000 as this bill does?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. No, it decreases taxation \$50,000,000.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLAND. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be limited to five minutes.

Mr. BLAND. I believe I had the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not recognized the gentleman from Missouri. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] moves that debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be limited to five minutes.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. MCKINLEY, there were—ayes 79, noes 59.

Mr. BLAND. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. BLAND and Mr. MCKINLEY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 88, noes 47.

So the motion of Mr. MCKINLEY to close debate was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto is limited to five minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield those five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], who has not yet occupied any time.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Chairman, I have not said anything during the progress of this debate, either in the general discussion or in the discussion of the specific schedules; but as I have looked through the bill and have listened to the remarks of gentlemen who have given minute attention to the details of the measure I have been struck with the fact that not one word has been said either in the bill itself or in the speeches of its advocates which looked to the protection of the great normal interest which lies at the foundation of all other interests in this country, that which bears the burden of all the taxation of the Government.

The "hewers of wood and the drawers of water" have not been recognized in this bill or in the discussion by our friends on the other side as included within the designation of "laborers."

Sir, the great fundamental interest of this country is the agricultural interest. If the great Master of the universe should curse with sterility for but a single season the bosom of our common mother, the earth, all its population must perish. You sometimes say that commerce is king; but commerce would be a monarch without a single subject to obey his behests, if agriculture did not sow the earth in due season and reap its fruits, and bear them to the seaboard in order that commerce might have something to deal with. Your magnificent docks, lining your Atlantic coast from New York to Galveston, would rot to the water's edge and your once vast carrying trade—alas, no longer vast, but dwindled under Republican rule to that of a fifth-rate power—would be eaten up by the barnacles of the ocean, every vessel of it.

This great interest is the foundation of everything; yet, as I have said, it is the bearer of the burdens of all others and is the least cared for. It is this great interest—an interest of which I am myself an humble member, for it has always been my fortune from early life to be a tiller of the soil, and I represent here tillers of the soil—it is this great interest which ought to receive some consideration.

You talk about your commerce; you talk about the ingots of gold and silver dug from your mines. But you may take the most splendid specimen of the mineral wealth of California and drop it into the soil; it lies there unproductive, uncreative, unregenerative. But take the smallest grain of corn or some other grain, drop it into the soil, and, obeying the law impressed upon it by the Grand Master of the universe, it perishes, and from its corruption there springs forth a germinal faculty which has defied the research of the scientist to tell whence it comes. After a while you see the delicate spear of grass appearing above the earth.

A little later, under the blessings of sunshine and shower, you see the beautiful silk come forth. Yet a little later on you see the golden tassels; and soon, amid the abundant leaves, the autumn winds bring to the husbandman's ear music more delightful than that which fell from the Eolian harp of old when insensate stones and trees clapped their hands for joy. [Applause.] Follow it a little further, and you find the grain gathered to your granaries and your barns. It is taken to the crushing machine and it comes back in the shape of the staff of life; it finds its way to your table to give muscle and sinew and bone and blood and brain to the laboring man of the country, whether he labors with his muscle or with his mind, in order that he may go forth and obey the mandate of the Creator to subdue the earth and make it multiply. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed not exceeding five minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. If the gentleman had made the request earlier in the afternoon there would not have been any objection, but we have wasted so much time with this particular paragraph—[Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been limited by order of the committee. The Clerk will proceed with the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

110. All articles of glass cut, engraved, painted, colored, printed, stained, decorated, silvered, or gilded, not including plate-glass silvered or looking-glass plates, 10 cents per pound and 50 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Before passing from the section I ask unanimous consent to make a merely verbal correction by inserting after the word "silvered," in line 13, a comma.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, while I recognize how carefully and laboriously the Committee on Ways and Means have worked in the preparation of this bill—

The CHAIRMAN. There is no amendment before the committee.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I was about to offer an amendment and introduce it by a few preliminary remarks.

I now move the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 110, amend by adding "lamp chimneys, 45 per cent."

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. While the committee have done very hard and laborious work, and given to all classes of industries of all kinds a fair and patient hearing, as I know from personal efforts before them, it is only natural, in fact it would be almost impossible if it were otherwise, that there should be some slight inconsistencies in a bill of this character, matters which require revision. The tariff on lamp chimneys was supposed to come in in section 112; but there is one word inserted in this section 110 which may bring under it this common article of daily use by all of the people and imposes upon it a very excessive rate of duty.

Under estimates made the duty upon the lamp chimneys amounts to more than 400 per cent. Under the old law it was 45 per cent., and under the administrative bill it is increased to something like 77 per cent., as is estimated.

Now, this is a simple and small article which goes into common use, and I believe this correction ought to be made. If it is placed at 45 per cent., which was the original rate, I am free to say that, if the administrative bill were before us and I had an opportunity, I should endeavor to reduce the tax there by striking out the rate fixed on packages, so as to leave lamp chimneys at 45 per cent. But as that may come up some other time, I prefer to have the duty in this, as in the last bill, 45 per cent. There are a number of other articles to which I wish to call attention when we reach section 114.

A MEMBER. How much will be the reduction that you propose here?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. The estimated duty as given to me—and I will not undertake to give the figures to gentlemen unless they desire to have them—the estimated duty is over 400 per cent., taking the specific duty and the duty that is imposed under the administrative bill as well. If you reduce it under this amendment, you place it right where it was before and make a rate sufficient on it, although at the same time is added to it the duty, as I have said, of the preceding bill, the administrative bill. But I do not believe that this is the occasion when that should be referred to; though I do hope that under that bill there will be some correction made in regard to packages of goods of this character, so that common articles in daily use, costing a small sum, but occupying rather a large bulk, will not be taxed at this excessive rate of duty.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Do you believe that raising the rate of duty decreases the price? [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I do believe that the protective policy, where it puts a duty on articles to protect American labor and capital, does reduce the price; but it has been so ably demonstrated by the chairman of the committee that no gentleman on the other side has been able to refute it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments to it be limited to five minutes.

Mr. BLAND. I move to amend by making it twenty-five minutes.

The question was taken on the amendment; the committee divided, and there were—ayes 48, noes 71.

Mr. BLAND. Let us have tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. BLAND and Mr. MCKINLEY were appointed tellers. The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 44, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLAND. I move to amend by inserting thirty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that amendment is not in order.

Mr. BLAND. Then I move to insert twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that is a second amendment to an amendment.

Mr. BLAND. But one amendment has been voted down.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. There is no amendment pending now, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will entertain the amendment of the gentleman.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 40, noes 75.

Mr. BLAND. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. BLAND and Mr. MCKINLEY were appointed tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 32, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLAND. I move to amend by making it fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will decline to recognize the gentleman's motion.

Mr. BLAND. I have a right to make the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not recognize the motion.

Mr. BLAND. Then I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not recognize the appeal.

Mr. BLAND. I thought that one czar in the House was enough, but the present occupant of the chair is trying to compare himself with a bigger one. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move that the committee do now rise. It is now ten minutes after 5 o'clock.

Mr. MCKINLEY. The committee will not rise if this side of the House will stand by me at this time.

The question was put; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 41, noes 85.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, and Mr. MCKINLEY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 35, noes 84.

So the committee refused to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to limit general debate to five minutes on this paragraph.

The question was put; and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLAND. Division. I suppose we can have a division. That will hardly be denied us.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 88, noes 42.

Mr. BLAND. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. BLAND and Mr. MCKINLEY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 46.

So the motion to limit debate was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not think it is just to limit debate on this section to five minutes. The present rate of duty on these articles is 45 per cent. The proposed rate is 50 per cent. ad valorem and then a specific duty of 10 cents a pound. Ten cents a pound and 5 per cent. ad valorem, in addition to that now provided by law, or 50 per cent. What are the facts? We had \$1,094,000 worth imported last year, and to show that the committee is not infallible in its facts and that this ought not to be gone through in a slipshod way, I want to call attention to the fact that the report made of the amount of duties gives it at \$492,340, which is \$54,000 less than the actual receipts at 50 per cent.

The actual duties would be \$547,045 and the rate of duty, if the House makes the increase that is demanded, will be, as near as I can make it by an accurate calculation, 90 per cent., instead of 45 per cent. That is the proposition that is pending before the House, and it is that increase against which we are commanded to shut our mouths and upon which we are throttled and not even allowed to make a statement concerning the enormities in the different paragraphs. What is the necessity for this? There is a mistake in the very report accompanying the bill.

It is the difference between \$547,000, which is the real amount, and \$492,000. It was so grave a matter that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CANDLER] felt compelled to rise and break away from his party and try to prevent the increase proposed in this section. Are people to have no voice here? Are all these hearings about which we heard so eloquently a few moments ago to amount to nothing for their benefit? Here is an increase which goes up to 100 per cent. from the present rate of duty. What is it for? Natural gas has been discovered in the West. It is not Germany, it is not England, it is not France, it is the West that is giving the East difficulties in the contest for the manufacture of glassware.

If the manufacturers of glass can close the ports of this country (and this closes them), then all they have to do is to follow the example of so many others who have closed the ports, organized their trusts, and have had a high carnival and declared high dividends. That is the purpose. It is not well to talk too much about these things it seems, and hence debate is cut off. We are to be cut off with five minutes' debate, and when we clamor against it and ask that there be debate we are told by the Chair that it is dilatory and will not be entertained. Go on, gentlemen, in your present course. Take this bill by this method whenever your please. But whenever you close the ports and the trusts are organized and the people have suffered as they will suffer if this bill shall pass, they will teach you that those who sow the wind must reap the whirlwind.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I only want to say a word in reply, and that is that this discussion to which the gentleman has addressed himself does not apply to the paragraph under consideration at all.

Mr. McMILLIN. It does.

Mr. MCKINLEY. It applies to paragraph 112, and not to the paragraph we are considering. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. There is nothing further from the truth.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I know exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. McMILLIN. If the gentleman knows what he is talking about—

Mr. MCKINLEY. It is paragraph 112. It is "thin blown glass, blown with or without molds"

Mr. McMILLIN. It is paragraph 110, and the mistake you made is the difference between \$492,000 and \$547,000.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Oh, you are talking about figures! But you are talking about a different paragraph. I am talking about the completion of this paragraph, and I do say that the gentleman's remarks do not apply to the paragraph.

Mr. McMILLIN. They do.

Mr. MCKINLEY. We have had too much talk.

Mr. McMILLIN. Why do you cut off debate? Is it because you are afraid of it?

Mr. MCKINLEY. We are not afraid of legitimate debate.

Mr. McMILLIN. You are afraid of the truth.

Mr. MCKINLEY. We are not afraid. You are speaking about something that does not apply to this paragraph.

Mr. McMILLIN. It does.

Mr. MCKINLEY. We have let you talk all this afternoon, and you have talked about nothing but the tariff generally.

Mr. McMILLIN. But you are cutting off debate. Now, sir, stop your throttling and let the debate go on if you are not afraid to have the truth known.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Not only are we tired of talk, but the country is tired of your talk. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. And the country is tired of you and your methods. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. The people want us to proceed with the public business. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. You want to proceed with further taxation, with your higher taxation, your greater robbery for the benefit of your plutocrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I tell the gentleman from Tennessee that the country wants work, not words; not words such as the gentleman and his friends have been giving us for the last three days.

Mr. McMILLIN. And we appeal from the plutocrats to the people. [Applause on the Democratic side and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. ANDREW. I ask unanimous consent that I may read a telegram which I have just received.

Several MEMBERS. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW]?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I object, because it probably is not applicable to this paragraph.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made that my amendment was not applicable to this schedule. I claim that it was. [Applause on the Democratic side and cries of "Regular order!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, debate upon this paragraph and amendments is exhausted.

Mr. ANDREW. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement of one minute. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. CUTCHEON. Make it on the next paragraph.

Mr. McADOO. I think that it is no more than fair that the gentleman should be allowed to make his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. BLAND and Mr. DUNNELL. Let the amendment be read.

The amendment was again read, as follows:

Amend section 110 by adding at the end of the section the words "lamp chimneys, 45 per cent. ad valorem."

The question was taken on the amendment; and the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I demand tellers.
Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 53, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
Mr. BLAND. I want to offer another amendment. I move to amend, after the word "cut," in the first line of paragraph 110, so as to make it read 45 per cent. ad valorem.
The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. BLAND; and the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.
Mr. BLAND. I demand a division.
The committee divided; and there were—ayes 48, noes 83.
Mr. BLAND. I demand tellers.
Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. BLAND and Mr. MCKINLEY.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 31, noes 75.
So the amendment was rejected.
Mr. BLAND. I desire to offer a further amendment. I move to insert after the word "engraved," in the same line, "45 per cent. ad valorem."

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. I make the point of order that that is the same amendment which has been already voted upon.
Mr. BLAND. No, it is a different amendment; "cut" glass and "engraved" glass are different things; "cut" is one kind and "engraved" is another.

Mr. BAYNE. I make a point of order upon that amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.
Mr. BAYNE. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CANDLER] offered an amendment providing for a duty of 45 per cent. ad valorem, and I understand this to be substantially the same proposition.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. The gentleman is mistaken in regard to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] is in order.
The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. BLAND, and the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLAND. I demand a division.
The committee divided; and there were—ayes 39, noes 71.
Mr. BLAND. I demand tellers.
Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. BLAND and Mr. MCKINLEY.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 24, noes 80.
So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a reasonable time for debate be allowed upon this important subject. I make this request in order to facilitate business.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not put the motion in that form. A "reasonable time" is not sufficiently definite.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. Well, half an hour on this section.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is reminded that the gentleman from Alabama is out of order, debate having been limited upon this paragraph. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:
111. Chemical glassware for use in laboratory, and not otherwise specially provided for in this act, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

112. Thin-blown glass, blown with or without a mold, and all other manufactures of glass, or of which glass shall be the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this act, 10 cents per dozen and 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I hoped to be able to say a word upon paragraph 110, but I was denied an opportunity. I desire to read a telegram which I have just received.
The telegram was read, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., May 14, 1890.

Hon. JOHN F. ANDREW, M. C.:

My letter said section 112 applied to German student-lamp chimneys, but it and section 110 are so ambiguous and unskillfully drawn, we think, that section 110 would be applied to chimneys, as the ends of the chimneys are cut at each end, which would exact as duty fully 450 per cent. Customs experts here confirm this. Will write you to-day.

A MEMBER. Whom is that from?
Mr. ANDREW. It is a telegram from Boston, sent by one of the largest dealers in glassware in this country.

A MEMBER. What is his name?
Mr. ANDREW. Jerome Jones, of the firm of Jones, McDuffie & Stratton, one of the largest glassware firms in Boston.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.
The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and to equalize duties on imports and had come to no resolution thereon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the further consideration of the estimates for agricultural experiment stations submitted on page 207 of the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1890, and the same were referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to submit a report from the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent that that report be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.
Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 1019) granting a pension to David A. Lippy;
A bill (H. R. 1045) granting a pension to Emily T. Pottle;
A bill (H. R. 1114) granting a pension to Mary A. Holland;
A bill (H. R. 1116) granting a pension Clara M. Owen;
A bill (H. R. 1246) granting a pension to Ann E. Mussman;
A bill (H. R. 1282) for the relief of John Dehart;
A bill (H. R. 1400) for the relief of Patrick Culhan;
A bill (H. R. 1456) granting a pension to Ira E. Smith;
A bill (H. R. 1471) granting a pension to Laura A. Yourtee;
A bill (H. R. 1579) granting a pension to John McCool;
A bill (H. R. 1581) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Ferguson;

A bill (H. R. 1586) granting a pension to Augustine McLaughlin;
A bill (H. R. 1622) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sallie F. Ward;

A bill (H. R. 1633) granting an increase of pension to Abram Duryee;
A bill (H. R. 1670) granting a pension to Sarah Hamilton;
A bill (H. R. 1672) granting a pension to Margaret P. Minter;
A bill (H. R. 1865) granting a pension to John Nagle;
A bill (H. R. 1987) granting a pension to Mary A. Kinsley;
A bill (H. R. 2007) granting a pension to the widow of Adam Shrake;
A bill (H. R. 2131) granting a pension to Gustav Alonzo Draper;
A bill (H. R. 2133) granting a pension to Betsey F. Newhall;
A bill (H. R. 2351) granting a pension to Allen McCowan;
A bill (H. R. 2352) granting a pension to W. S. Yohe;
A bill (H. R. 2356) granting a pension to Matthew J. J. Cagle;
A bill (H. R. 2435) increasing the pension of Mary Minor Hoxey;
A bill (H. R. 2722) granting a pension to Mary Ann Trainor, widow of Francis Trainor, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 2738) granting a pension to Christiana Schneider;
A bill (H. R. 2769) granting a pension to Isaac Clark;
A bill (H. R. 2824) granting a pension to Charles A. Platz;
A bill (H. R. 2837) granting a pension to Alvira A. Edwards;
A bill (H. R. 2989) granting a pension to Mrs. Martha E. Jones;
A bill (H. R. 3058) granting a pension to George L. Brightley;
A bill (H. R. 3108) granting a pension to Levi M. Lincoln;
A bill (H. R. 3218) to place the name of Pauline Bichweiler on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 3404) for the relief of John Curran;
A bill (H. R. 3530) to grant a pension to Huldah Burton;
A bill (H. R. 3536) to grant a pension to Samuel L. Dark;
A bill (H. R. 3543) to grant a pension to John Green Reed;
A bill (H. R. 3545) granting a pension to Harriet F. Bowers;
A bill (H. R. 3574) granting a pension to Mary E. Tipton;
A bill (H. R. 3381) for restoration to the pension-rolls of Nelson G. Edwards;

A bill (H. R. 3583) to pension Samuel Wyrick for service in the Indian war;

A bill (H. R. 3584) to pension William J. Dunn for service in the Indian war;

A bill (H. R. 3586) to pension William B. Carter for service in the Indian war;

A bill (H. R. 3588) to pension Mary J. Mann, widow of John W. Mann, who served in the Indian war;

A bill (H. R. 3591) granting a pension to Mary J. Nottage;

A bill (H. R. 3594) for the relief of Mary Conley;

A bill (H. R. 3596) for the relief of Harriet E. Brown;

A bill (H. R. 3740) granting a pension to Lucy H. M. Norman;

A bill (H. R. 3872) to amend section 2599 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, designating ports of delivery in the district of Michigan;

A bill (H. R. 3961) to increase the pension of Stephen Cooper;

A bill (H. R. 4024) for the relief of Daniel W. Parrish;

A bill (H. R. 4027) granting a pension to William A. Merriwether;

A bill (H. R. 4028) granting a pension to Agnes Vetter;

A bill (H. R. 4038) granting a pension to James Fitzgerald;

A bill (H. R. 4046) to pension Mary Bailey;

A bill (H. R. 4102) granting a pension to Elizabeth Heckler;

A bill (H. R. 4126) granting a pension to H. G. Church;

A bill (H. R. 4127) granting a pension to Rhoda Williams;

A bill (H. R. 4132) granting a pension to Esther G. Bryant;
 A bill (H. R. 4152) granting an increase of pension to Albert Mabb;
 A bill (H. R. 4205) granting a pension to Isabella B. Stimple;
 A bill (H. R. 4306) to pension Rebecca Bolerjack;
 A bill (H. R. 4359) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ogden;
 A bill (H. R. 4372) granting a pension to John Dean;
 A bill (H. R. 4393) for the relief of Mary Dockham;
 A bill (H. R. 4414) for the relief Wesley W. Taylor;
 A bill (H. R. 4422) to increase the pension of Lucian L. Sanborn;
 A bill (H. R. 4423) to grant a pension to Lucinda A. Clark;
 A bill (H. R. 4030) granting a pension to Mary Ann Allan;
 A bill (H. R. 4424) granting a pension to Fannie E. Woodbury;
 A bill (H. R. 4441) granting a pension to Eveline M. Alexander;
 A bill (H. R. 1482) granting a pension to Barbara Schnappinger;
 A bill (H. R. 4587) granting a pension to Daniel M. Dull, late a soldier of the Mexican war;
 A bill (H. R. 5431) for the relief of William D. Hummer;
 A bill (H. R. 4532) for the relief of Thomas N. Maxwell;
 A bill (H. R. 4789) granting a pension to George Dodge;
 A bill (H. R. 4808) granting a pension to Roxanna Finch;
 A bill (H. R. 4810) to pension Christina Edson for meritorious services rendered the Government during the Indian wars in the Oregon Territory, now the State of Oregon;
 A bill (H. R. 4811) to pension William G. Hill;
 A bill (H. R. 4821) to pension Eli J. Youngheim;
 A bill (H. R. 4862) granting a pension to William H. Coppinger;
 A bill (H. R. 4866) granting a pension to Ida L. Martin;
 A bill (H. R. 4868) granting a pension to Henrietta Judd;
 A bill (H. R. 5081) to pension Helen A. Moore;
 A bill (H. R. 5082) to pension Polly Robinson;
 A bill (H. R. 5083) to pension Emily G. Mills;
 A bill (H. R. 5456) to increase pension of Richard W. Spain, late sergeant Company A, Second Dragoons, United States Army;
 A bill (H. R. 5606) to increase the pension of James C. Copeland;
 A bill (H. R. 5618) granting a pension to Malvina P. Fletcher, widow of John P. Fletcher, late private Company D, First Michigan Engineers;
 A bill (H. R. 5626) granting a pension to Hannah Ward;
 A bill (H. R. 5632) granting a pension to Sarah Sheldon;
 A bill (H. R. 5739) increasing pension of Sophia Schimmelfennig, widow of Alexander Schimmelfennig, late brigadier-general and major-general by brevet;
 A bill (H. R. 5905) to pension Thomas K. Edwards for service in the Indian war;
 A bill (H. R. 6419) to amend section 2294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes;
 A bill (H. R. 6688) asking an increase of pension for Mary H. Nicholson;
 A bill (S. 1477) to increase the appropriation for the erection of a public building at Sacramento, Cal.; and
 A joint resolution (H. Res. 12) authorizing the use and improvement of Fort Sewall at Marblehead, Mass.

NORTHERN CHEYENNE INDIANS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message of the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication of the 10th instant from the Secretary of the Interior, and the accompanying copies of correspondence, relative to the condition of the Northern Cheyenne Indians at the Pine Ridge agency, South Dakota. The desire of these Indians to be united upon some common reservation with their brethren now occupying the Tongue River reserve in Montana is quite natural; and such an arrangement would, I think, promote the best interests of both of these bands.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 13, 1890.

BENJ. HARRISON.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the session of the House to-morrow begin at 11 o'clock.

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

And then, on motion of Mr. MCKINLEY (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

TESTIMONY ON IMPORTATION OF CONTRACT LABOR.

Letter from the Secretary of State, inclosing copy of a communication from the under secretary of state, British Foreign Office, relating to certain testimony given before the Select Committee on the Importation of Contract Labor, Convicts, and Paupers, Fiftieth Congress—to be filed with the records of said committee.

ROADWAY FROM ATLANTA, GA., TO FORT M'PHERSON, GA.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of an appropriation for commencing the construction of a public roadway from Atlanta, Ga., to Fort McPherson, Ga.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

PURCHASE OF MACHINE-GUNS FOR THE ARMY.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of appropriation for machine-guns of small-arms caliber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FREE REGISTRATION OF OFFICIAL MAIL MATTER BY CENSUS OFFICIALS.

Letter from the Secretary of the Interior, inclosing the draught of a bill, with accompanying letter from the Acting Superintendent of Census, providing for the free registration of official mail matter by the Superintendent, supervisors, enumerators, and special agents of the Census Bureau—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ENGINEERS IN PARIS.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the chief of engineers and a copy of a report of Lieutenant-Colonel Merrill, of the Corps of Engineers, with copies of accompanying papers, including two maps, concerning the international congress of engineers interested in the utilization of water, which was convened under the auspices of the Government of France, and recommending that the same be printed—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

MEMORIALS AND RESOLUTIONS OF STATE LEGISLATURES.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, the following memorials and resolutions of State Legislatures were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLOWER: Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, in regard to adulterated food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, asking for adjustment of claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, in regard to Theodore R. Timby—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A bill (S. 20) granting right of way across United States lands in St. Augustine, Fla.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 248) for the erection of a public building at Tampa, Fla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 376) authorizing the Secretary of War to purchase a lot in the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 498) to authorize the Brightwood Railway Company to construct a branch line to Tacoma—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1518) for the relief of Orin R. McDaniel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1618) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 1641) to empower Robert Adger and others to bring suit in the Court of Claims for rent alleged to be due them—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1904) to provide for railroad crossings in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2532) for the relief of William H. Atkins, formerly commissary sergeant, United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 2553) to remove the charge of desertion and of having enlisted in the Confederate service from the records of the War Department standing against John McFarland, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2648) granting right of way to the Junction City and Fort Riley Street Railway Company into and upon the Fort Riley military reservation in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2690) to provide for the construction of a wagon-road through the military reservation of Fort Canby, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3064) to establish a fog-signal at or near Cuckold's Island, at the entrance of Booth Bay Harbor, otherwise known as Townsend Harbor, Maine—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3116) to punish the carrying or selling of deadly or dangerous weapons within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 3143) to provide and equip a steam-vessel to be used in the collection district of Puget Sound—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3280) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain

damages resulting to any person who had settled upon the Crow Creek and Winnebago reservations, in South Dakota, between February 27, 1885, and April 17, 1885—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3358) for a public building for a marine hospital at Galipolis, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 3571) to provide an American register for the barge Ottawa of Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

A bill (S. 3622) to fix the time and places for holding Federal courts in the district of Kansas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3640) to amend section 19 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887—to the Committee on Commerce.

RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, the following resolutions were introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. ATKINSON, of Pennsylvania:

Resolved, That Tuesday, May 27, 1890, after sixty minutes of the morning hour have been passed, be fixed for the consideration, in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, of the bill (H. R. 750) to authorize the payment of damages sustained by citizens of the State of Pennsylvania from Union and Confederate troops during the late war, as adjudicated and liquidated by the State of Pennsylvania, under the provisions of an act of the General Assembly of the said State of Pennsylvania, approved the 22d day of May, A. D. 1871, and to continue from day to day until said bill is finally disposed of; this order not to interfere with the consideration of revenue and general appropriation bills and prior special orders;

to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WADE:

Resolved, That Tuesday, June 3, 1890, after sixty minutes of the morning hour have expired, be fixed for the consideration of such bills as the Committee on Labor may call up for consideration, this order not to interfere with the consideration of general appropriation bills or prior special orders;

to the Committee on Rules.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk and disposed of as follows:

Mr. SCULL, from the Committee on Pensions, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 4128) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Chandler—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 9523) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Gunter'sville, Ala., and for other purposes—to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, reported with amendment the following bills of the House; which were severally referred to the House Calendar:

A bill (H. R. 9677) to authorize the county of Pulaski, in the State of Georgia, to maintain a high wagon and foot bridge across the Ocmulgee River at or near Hawkinsville, in the State of Georgia; and

A bill (H. R. 9521) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River.

Mr. RANDALL, from the Committee on Pensions, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 9245) granting a pension to Louis P. Noros, late of the Jeannette expedition to the Arctic Ocean—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the bill of the Senate (S. 2960) to authorize the building of a bridge at Pine Bluff, Ark., across the Arkansas River—to the House Calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills of the following titles were introduced, severally read twice, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLOWER: A bill (H. R. 10192) to adjust the claims of the States against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ATKINSON, of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10193) providing for the assessment and collection of water rents and water-main taxes in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WIKE: A bill (H. R. 10194) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a railway bridge across the Illinois River, extending from a point within 5 miles of Columbiana, in Greene County, to a point within 5 miles of Farrowtown, in Calhoun County, in the State of Illinois," approved March 3, 1883—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TUCKER (by request): A bill (H. R. 10195) to provide a hospital for consumptive invalid soldiers of the late war and the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITCH (by request): A bill (H. R. 10196) providing for extradition in certain cases—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following change of reference was made:

A bill (H. R. 8996) for the relief of Charles L. Eastergreen, sole heir

and legal representative of Sarah M. Eastergreen, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 10197) for the relief of Thomas H. L. Payne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: A bill (H. R. 10198) to correct the military record of Enols Loyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 10199) granting a pension to Adolphus Hess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10200) granting an increase of pension to Narcissa Murray, widow of Samuel A. Murray, a soldier of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITHIAN: A bill (H. R. 10201) granting a pension to G. B. Duncan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLICK: A bill (H. R. 10202) granting a pension to O. E. Hukill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK: A bill (H. R. 10203) for the relief of James M. Dugan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10204) for the relief of H. J. Fryor—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 10205) authorizing the President to appoint and retire John W. Hines with the rank and grade of second lieutenant, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. QUINN: A bill (H. R. 10206) to amend the military record of Alexander Watts, late captain Sixty-third New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCRANTON: A bill (H. R. 10207) for the appropriation of \$10,000 to Henry George—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART, of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10208) granting an increase of pension to Moses Graham—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART, of Vermont (by request): A bill (H. R. 10209) for the relief of Henry C. La Point—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STIVERS: A bill (H. R. 10210) granting a pension to John E. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 10211) to reimburse Jacob Falwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 10212) for the relief of James Ballard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10213) granting a pension to John B. Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YODER: A bill (H. R. 10214) granting a pension to Clara O. Day—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWER: Petition of George W. Stewart and 12 others, citizens of Genesee County, Michigan, praying for the passage of the McKinley tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWER: Petition of W. H. Snow and 90 others, citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of North Carolina, asking for the passage of laws for the perpetuation of the national banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of J. W. Hunter and 136 others, citizens of the same district, for the same purpose—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CANDLER, of Georgia: Petition of Oakland Farmers' Alliance, Dawson County, Georgia, for the passage of the bill appropriating \$6,200,000 to improve Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CARLTON: Petition from Alliance men of Greene County, Georgia, asking passage of Senate bill 2716—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition from Alliance men of Greene County, Georgia, asking passage of House bill 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAIG: Petition of citizens of Greensburgh, Pa., for tariff legislation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Grange 921, Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, in favor of duties on agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of same grange, in same county and State, for free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial of Post 434, Grand Army of the Republic, of Sprankle's Mills, Jefferson County, Pennsylvania, in favor of dependent and service pension bills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of Col. William H. Moody Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of Rev. R. E. Hickenger and 160 others, citizens of Pocahontas, Carroll, and Calhoun Counties, Iowa, in favor of a law against violation of State laws by the interstate liquor traffic—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, three petitions of citizens of Iowa, against increase of duty on foreign granite, on breech-loading guns, and cutlery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORSEY: Petition of citizens of Fremont, Nebr., protesting against the passage of parts of House bill 8278—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition from the Young Men's Christian Association of Fremont, Nebr., asking for passage of bill providing for additional chaplains in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOWER: Petitions from charity organization and 200 others, in the city of New York, in regard to emigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FUNSTON (by request): Resolution granting authority to Wyandotte Indian tribe to remove the remains of their deceased relatives from burying-ground at Kansas City, Kans., and to sell the grounds—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GEAR: Resolutions of Torrence Post, of Keokuk, Iowa, in regard to a service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of L. G. Baldwin Post, of Libertyville, Iowa, asking an amendment to pension laws in regard to widows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIMES: Petition of Rotherwood Alliance, of Carroll County, Georgia, for a first-class harbor on the Gulf coast of Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Antioch Suballiance, of Harris County, Georgia, in favor of a first-class harbor on the Texas coast—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina: Petition of S. Wilkinson and 34 others, citizens of Catawba, N. C., requesting the passage of House bill 7162 or Senate bill 2806, known as subtreasury plan—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolutions of Tippecanoe Club, Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the passage of a law to prevent the interference with local prohibitory laws through interstate commerce—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of B. M. Bixby and others, of What Cheer, Iowa, against advance of duty on guns—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mahaska County (Iowa) Farmers' Alliance, in favor of the Conger lard bill and the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Resolution of Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, favoring speedy publication of Official Records of the Rebellion—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. POST: Resolutions of the Illinois State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring the pure-food and pure-lard bills—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAINES: Petition of residents of Twenty-ninth Congressional district of New York, to pass the McKinley tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, praying for a perpetuation of the national-banking laws—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROCKWELL: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts, relative to the national-banking laws—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCULL: Memorial of Grange No. 934, Somerset County, Pennsylvania, for free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SMITH, of West Virginia: Petition for the passage of laws for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SNIDER: Resolution of the directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis, Minn., asking for amendment of sections 4 and 5 of the interstate-commerce law, for repeal of long and short haul clause so far as it relates to competing points, permitting division of traffic among railroad companies under supervision of the commissioners—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Memorial of Mr. H. Schlange, proprietor of the Staats-Wochenblatt, and other citizens of Springfield, Ill., protesting against any material change in the immigration and naturalization laws—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of citizens of Iron Mountain, Menominee County, Michigan, for the amendment of the national-banking laws and the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Colorado: Protest against the tobacco schedule of the tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution to investigate the private claims of settlers on the Maxwell and Sangre de Cristo land grants—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. TUCKER: Petition of citizens of Appomattox County, Vir-

ginia, for a harbor on the Gulf coast of Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WALLACE, of New York: Petition of 185 cigar manufacturers of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the schedule on leaf-tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama: Petition of S. D. Herman, of Alabama, for the passage of the subtreasury bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. B. Turner, of the same State, for the same law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILEY: Petition for laws relating to national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Memorial of Grange No. 226, of Wyoming County, Pennsylvania, in favor of certain tariff duties on imports of farm products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from Grange 508, of same county and State, for free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial from Grange No. 926, of same county and State, for same purpose—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. YODER: Petition of citizens of Greenville, Darke County, Ohio, in favor of pure lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 15, 1890.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, presented resolutions of T. F. Bradford Post, No. 24, Grand Army of the Republic, of Tama, Iowa, in favor of the passage of the per diem service-pension bill and the repeal of the limitation in the arrears-of-pensions law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the legislative committee of the Virginia State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the passage of House bill 283, known as the "pure lard" bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of Lieut. William H. Kinkead Post, No. 293, Grand Army of the Republic, of Houtzdale, Pa., praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill 3530, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to reopen the navy-yard at League Island, Pennsylvania, for the construction and repair of vessels of the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Valley Grange, No. 52, Patrons of Husbandry, of Millville, Columbia County, Pennsylvania, praying for an increase of duty on imported agricultural products; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the American Association of Flint and Lime Glass Manufacturers, of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankrupt bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Keiserville Grange, No. 508, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wyoming County, Pennsylvania, and the petition of Vale Grange, No. 934, Patrons of Husbandry, of Somerset County, Pennsylvania, praying for the free coinage of silver; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Chestnut Hill Council, No. 215, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for an amendment of the Constitution prohibiting any State from enacting legislation in regard to the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of 123 citizens of Ray County, Missouri, and a petition of 90 citizens of Jacksonville, Mo., praying for the free coinage of silver; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the passage of measures looking to reciprocal commercial relations with Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of ex-soldiers, residents of Flora, Ill., praying for the passage of the 1 cent per diem pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the petition of A. E. McQuoid, John F. Suter, and 9 others, citizens of Rutledge, Scotland County, Missouri, praying for the prompt passage of the bill making it unlawful to transport liquor from any State or Territory of the United States into any other State or Territory contrary to the laws thereof. That bill having been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, I move that the petition lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.